P A 1036. N. 8

A THIRD DEFENCE *Of the* CAUSE *of* PEACE,

PROVING

1. The need of our Concord. 2. The Impossibility of it, on the Terms of the present Impositions.

Against the Accusations and Storms of,

VIZ.

Mr. *John Hinckley.*
A Nameless Impleader.
A Nameless Reflector, or *Speculum*, *&c.*
Mr. *John Cheney*'s Second Accusation.
Mr. *Roger L'Strange*, Justice, *&c.*
The Dialogue between the Pope and a Fanatic.
J. Varney's Phanatic Prophesie.

By *RICHARD BAXTER.*

Psalm 120. 6. 7. *My Soul hath long dwelt with him that hateth peace. I am for peace, but when I speak they are for War.*
Rom. 3. 17. *The way of peace they have not known.*

London, Printed for *Jacob Sampson*, next to the *Wonder* Tavern in *Ludgate-Street.* 1681.

DR. WILLIAMS'S LIBRARY
RED CROSS STREET
LONDON.

The Preface.

Readers,

IF this striving work be unpleasant to you, it must be much more so to me: It is not the least advantage that Satan getteth against the Church, that by other mens sins he can occasion that to become our duty, which else would be a sinfull loss of time, and against the peace of our selves and others. A multitude of hereſies make it our duty, to read abundance of Books, and study thoſe languages, and trifling Arts, which else were needleſs: And the multitude of Erroneous, malignant, and other adverſaries, and the variety of their aſſaults, maketh many Defences, Evidences, Witneſſes, *and* Confutations *neceſſary, which else would ſignifie that evil Contentiouſneſs, which the aſſaulters manifeſt. Though the ſervant of the Lord muſt not ſtrive, yet muſt we contend*

ear-

earneſtly for the Faith, and muſt not forſake and betray truth and innocency. And the neceſſitated Defender may do his duty, while the wilfull Aggreſſor doth ſinfully militate againſt Truth, Charity, *and* Peace. *And as we muſt love our Enemies, ſo we take our ſelves bound much more, to love our tempted envyous brethren; and if they uſe us as* Joſeph, *caſt us into the Pit and ſell us as ſlaves, we will call them brethren ſtill, and hope one day their repentance will render them more lovely than they are. And though ſome Preach Chriſt in* Envy, Strife, *and* Contention, *to add to our affliction, and not ſincerely, we rejoyce and will rejoyce that Chriſt is Preached: And though they would* drive us out from the inheritance of the Lord, 1 *Sam.* 26. 19. *We will not venture with David to curſe them,*

but

but ſay as he in another purſuit, 2 *Sam.* 15. 25. 26. Carry back the Ark of God into the City: If I ſhall find favour in the Eyes of the Lord, he will bring me again, and ſhew me both it and his Habitation. But if he thus ſay, I have no delight in thee, behold, here am I, let him do to me as ſeemeth good to him. *In my endeavours for peace theſe Thirty Four Years, as I have been put to publiſh many things which I had rather might have been ſpared, ſo I have written to ſatisfie others, the Quantity of many Volumes, which I caſt away as unneceſſary to the World. But ſome men that I have dealt with, will not give me and the Reader ſuch an indulgence.*

Mr. Dodwell *is one who ſhall have his anſwer by it ſelf.* Mr. Hinkley *is another, to whoſe laſt Letter I wrote an anſwer about Nine Years*

ago:

ago: But he would not so bury his Talent, but hath printed my former Letters with his answer, and so called and constrained me to publish my last reply. Fame reporteth that the Impleader *is* Mr. Long *of* Exeter, *who heretofore wrote an Accusing Book, of which I gave him a private Epistolary Animadversion. Who the* Reflector *or the Author of the* Speculum *is I know not, the Subject calleth me to no particular Answer. He and* Mr. Roger le strange, *who argue in the same Mood and Figure, make me little work: which concerneth others, They mistook the question, as if it had been,* what the World should think of me. *In which I leave them to their Liberty without much contradiction.*

But our question is First, whether the Concord of Protestants being supposed necessary, the silencing, imprisoning, fining, *and* banishing *from* Corporations, *all Ministers that take*

Con-

Conformity to the present Impositions to be a sin, be the way of Peace and Concord, either probable or possible to attain the end. Mr. John Cheny, *I judge a godly serious man: who being neer me and familiar with me, never told me a word of his exceptions, nor gave me the least touch of a private Admonition for all the* Atheism, Infidelity, Wickedness, Abomination, destroying all Religion &c. *Which he accuseth me of in print: And his* Book *is so dismal a piece of work, in its extraordinary privation of* Common Reason, Truth, Charity, Tenderness *and* Modesty, *that I am constrained to think that the honest man is diseasedly melancholly: And I have known some well meaning men in that disease, that are so tenacious of all their own Conceptions, that they are still fiercely confident that the grossest things that they hold and say are right, and passionately reject all that is said against*

againſt them. Whom he hath reported to be his Inſtigator, I ſhall not here proclaim. The Dialogue *between the* Pope *and a* Phanatick, *and* Joh. Varney's Propheſie, *I leave the Reader to anſwer himſelf, as he findeth cauſe. If any man think it a ſervice to God to accuſe me and others, and juſtifie our ſilencing and the impoſed penalties, I intreat him to remember the Ninth Commandement, and that God and his Church need not Lies for their Service, but its he that is both the Father of them, and a Lyar from the be ginning. That was a lying Spirit in the Mouth of all* Ahabs Prophets, *(even of him that ſmote* Micaiah, *for ſuppoſing the Spirit of God departed from him,) and whoſe work on Earth againſt Chriſt and Souls, is done by* Deceit, *and* Wrath, *and* Hurtfulneſs; *Imitating him will diſgrace your cauſe and you: And Light will not ſo eaſily be hid. Great is truth and will finally*

finally prevaile. And all the waves do but break themselves, who dash against this impregnable rock. I call this Book, A Third Defence *of the* cause of Peace, *with respect to two former, One in answer to the Accusation of* Mr. John Cheny, *the other in answer to* Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, *men whom I once thought more unlikely than most other to become our Accusers.*

All

All Mr. *Gouge's* Works.

POlitical and Military Obſervations of the *Court* and *Camp* of *France* during the late Wars in *Flanders*, *Germany*, *&c.*

Sacramental Meditations upon divers ſelect places of Scripture, wherein Believers are aſſiſted in preparing their hearts, and exciting their Affections and Graces, when they draw nigh to God in that moſt awful ſolemn Ordinance of the *Lords Supper*. By *John Flavel* Miniſter of Chriſt, in *Devon*. 12°. price 1 *s.* 6 *d.*

A peaceable reſolution of Conſcience touching our preſent *Impoſitions*, wherein *Loyalty* and *Obedience* are propoſed and ſettled upon their *true Foundation* in *Scripture*, *Reaſon*, and *Conſtitution* of this *Kingdom*, againſt all reſiſtance of the *preſent Powers*, and with compliance with the *Laws* ſo far as may be in order to *Union*. With a *Draught* or *Specimen* of a *Bill* for Accommodation. *Octavo*, price 2 *s.*

The *Narrative* of *Rob. Bolron* of *Shippon-hall*, Gent. concerning the late *horrid Popiſh Plot* and *Conſpiracy*, for the Deſtruction of His Majeſty and the *Proteſtant Religion*:

Wherein is contained,

1. His *Informations* upon Oath before His Majeſty in *Council*, and before ſeveral Juſtices of the Peace, of the ſaid *Deſign*, and the means by which he arrived at the knowledge thereof.

2. Some particular Applications made to himſelf to aſſiſt thoſe deſign'd in the murdering of his Majeſty; the perſons by whom ſuch Applications were made, and the Reward promiſed.

3. The project of the *Popiſh party* to Erect a *Nunnery* at *Dolebanck* near *Ripely* in *Yorkſhire*, together with the Names of ſome *Nuns*, actually deſign'd for that Imployment, and taking the Profeſſion upon them: As alſo an Account of a certain Eſtate of 90 *l. per annum*, given by Sir *Thomas Galcoigne* to the *Nunnery* for ever. With other remarkable Paſſages relating to the *horrid Plot*. Together with an Account of the Endeavours that were uſed by the *Popiſh party* to ſtifle his Evidence.

The

The *Narrative* of *Lawrence Mowbray* of *Leeds* in the County of *York*, Gent. concerning the *bloody Popish Conspiracy* against the Life of his Sacred Majesty, the Government, and the Protestant Religion:

Wherein is contained,

1. His knowledge of the said *Design* from the very first in the Year 1676; with the Opportunity he had to be acquainted therewith, and the Reasons why he concealed it so long: with the manner of his discovering the said wicked Project to his Majesty, and his most honourable *Privy Council*.

2. How far Sir *Thomas Gascoigne*, Sir *Miles Stapleton*, &c. are ingaged in the *Design* of *Killing the King*, and *Fireing the City* of *London* and *York*, for the more speedy setting uppermost the *Popish Religion* in *England*.

3. An Account of the Assemblings of many *Popish Priests* and *Jesuits* at Father *Risbton*'s Chamber, at Sir *Thomas Gascoigne*'s house at *Barnebow*; with their *Consultations* and *Determinations*: with other considerable matters relating to the *Plot*. Together with an account of the Endeavours that were used to stifle his Evidence, by making an Attempt upon his Life in *Leicester Fields*: price 6 *d*.

A *Memento* for the *English Protestants*, &c. with an *Answer* to that part of the *Compendium* which reflects on the Bishop of *Lincoln*'s late Book. *Quarto*: price stitcht 6 *d*.

Naked Truth, the first part: Being the true state of the Primitive Church. By an humble *Moderator*: price stitcht *one shilling*.

Causa Dei; Or an *Apology for God*: wherein the perpetuity of Infernal Torments is evinced, and Divine Goodness and Justice (that notwithstanding) defended, &c. By *Richard Burthogge*, M. D.

Tully's elect Orations.

Gouge's Works, *Octavo*.

Horrid *Popish Plot* in a Pack of Cards

A second Pack, continuing a Representation of their Villainous Design, from the publication of the first Pack to the last *Sessions* of *Parliament*, begun *Octob.* 21. 1680.

AN ANSVVER TO MR. *HINCKLEY.*

SIR,

I Have perused yours, (I think *Impartially*) and to tell you my Judgment of it, I perceive, is like to offend you more. I find it is natural to men to desire to be thought to be in *the right*, and to have *said well*, and *done well*, be it *never so ill*. It is some Honour to *Truth and Goodness*, that the *Names and Reputation* of them seem desirable to those that cannot endure the *things*; yea, that the *Things* are never loathed or opposed *formally* as such, but for their opposition to *somewhat*, that is more loved. And it is some help to the *depression* of *Falshood* and *Sin*, that it is ashamed of its *own Name*, and cannot endure to see its own *Face*, which hath ever inclined it to break the *Glass*; though to its greater *shame*, when every *piece* will shew that *ugliness* which was shewed but by the *whole* before. If nothing else had notified it to us, one might have *strongly suspected* that you are of that

Tribe, who take themselves to be *persecuted* when they may not *domineer*, and when others may but *Preach and live* without their Consent; by your *excessive tenderness* and *impatience*, calling it *Poyson*, *Hornets*, and abundance of such *smarting angry Names*, if a man that is cast out of *God's Vineyard* as well as his *Maintenance* among many hundreds more, do but plainly in a *private Letter* speak for himself, and shew the *injustice* of your *Printed Accusations*. O! that you were all but the thousandth part as tender, (I will not say of your *Brethrens sufferings*) but of the *danger* of many thousand *perishing starved Souls?* I shall only tell you this much in general, that I now perceive you are used but for a *Temptation to me*, to lose *my time*, by the neglect of *better Work*. And that you do so *notoriously bawk the Truth*, and hide *Untruth* in a heap of *Confident Rhetorical Flourishes*; that while you are of this *temperament*, I will not undertake to prove to you that *Two* and *Two* are *Four*.

1. My *Beginning* was taken from your *Ending*; where you wrote [*You will satisfie your self, as little as you will do others*] And what *others Mind know you better than your own?* And sure that which *satisfieth not you*, doth you *no good* as to its *proper end*, what ever it may do *by accident* some other way. Yet it seems you forgot that you had written this, and that was warrant enough for all your confident *Impertinencies* on that occasion. *Sandy foundations*, *light* and *darkness*, *Hornets Nests*, *rushing into the midst of the Pikes*, *waking Dragons*, the *golden Fleece*, *&c.* come all in upon this your *oversight:* And you seem to think that you have acquit your self well.

2. You

2. You tell me *of bringing the Controversie to an issue by dint of Scripture, whether you sin in Conforming.* Is this fairly done, to pretend that to be the *Controversie* which I never undertook to meddle with? Could you possibly forget, 1. That *You* were the *Plaintiff* and *Accuser* in *Print*, not content that your *Brethren* were forbidden to *Preach Christ*, and that many of them live in great *poverty* and *want?* You wrote a Book of *reproachful Oratory*, with no strength of *Argument* worthy an *Answer*, to make them seem the *flagitious Causes* of their own *silence* and *sufferings:* Against which, they (that meddled not with you) had nothing to do but to *justifie themselves.* 2. That in this Book you vehemently importune me, who never knew you, nor meddled with you, *to give the World the Reasons of my Non-conformity.* 3. That hereupon the *Question* that I treated about with you, was, *How I may have leave to do it.* And whether it be ingenious thus publickly to urge me to that which you know I cannot do. This was all the *Controversie* I had with you. I tell you again, I would go on my knees to any Bishop in *England*, to procure but License for my self alone, (much more my *Brethren*) to *Write* and *Print* the *Reasons* of our *Non-conformity*, after Nine years *Silence*, *Suffering*, and *Accusation*; that the *World* and *Posterity* may but once hear us speak for our selves: And I would be engaged to leave out all such *plain expressions* as now offend you. But to begin such a Work, when I know I cannot *Print it*; or to enter a *Dispute* with you in this rambling way, (whose *Books* and *Letters* tell me that you will *Syllogize* in *Aristophanes*, or *Lucian's*

Moods and Figures; and whose *Logick* will take up no greater room among your *Oratorical Diversions*, *Evasions*, *Subterfuges*, and *Flosculi*, than a spoonful of Wine in a Gallon of Water, which will leave it Water still. I shall not easily be drawn to this, having lost so much time upon you already, as I have done: Therefore you here bring in your *Serpents Head* and *Tail* and *Fable*, upon a false Supposition of the Subject of our *Debates*.

§. 1. Here first, you would have your Book go for *Innocent*; no wonder: *Impenitence* is no rarity, among *those* whose office is to Preach *Repentance*: And therefore so many of them go without the *Fruits* of it, *Matth.* 7. 22, 23. And he that can write against *Truth*, can defend it by *Untruth*. 2. You untruly suppose me to undertake the *Confutation* of your *Book*. But who hath so little to do, as to shew particularly of each *Page* and *Line* of a Bundle of impotent *Oratorian Revilings*, how little *Logick* or *Truth* is in them. 3. You untruly suppose me not to have opened the faultiness of any *Page* of your *Book*: Let the *Impartial* judge. 4. In all, you shew the strange unacquaintedness with your *Self*, and your *Own*, which you cannot endure to be told of. A *Calumniating Volume* of yours is *Innocent*, and affordeth no matter for blame or repentance: But to be told so, is to let fall *such Drops on you as make you smart* (you say) *as if there had been poyson in them*. If we that are forbidden to eat a *Bit*, or wear a Rag of the *Levites Portion*, or come within Five Miles of any *Corporation*, or Preach Christ to the most *ignorant miserable Souls*; do but think

and

and say, it is *hard usage*: We add to our *guilt*, and deserve yet *worse*, because we do not *Toto pectore telum recipere*: Or as *Camero*, unbutton our Doublets, and cry, *Feri miser*. But if we tell you of it, when you *voluminously* play with *Reproaches* upon them, that you are utterly unable to prove *guilty* and *confute*; *Oh, it maketh you smart like poyson.* Guilt is always tender, but most in the *Domineering Tribe.* They are *contemned* and *scorned*, if we take not their *strokes* for *stroakings*, and their *calumnies* for *kindness*: And to tell them that their *slanders* are *injuries*, is to call them *to veil their Bonnets to us*, and we are *Popular Rabbies* (for being against the *Rabbies*). if the people (that *know them and us*, will not (because they *cannot*) believe all the *falshoods* which such report of us, who find no readier and surer steps for their Ascension to their desired Heights.

§. 2. First, Here you would be my *Tutor* in *Logick*, to teach me that the *Species is not comprehended in the Genus.* And that *I transgress the Laws of Discourse*, in supposing that what was spoken against the *Non-conformists*, *as such*, was spoken against the *Presbyterian Non-conformists.* This is my *incloshing* and *limiting*: As if I had offended by saying, that you say that against *Man*, which you say against an *Animal* as such. And this Talk needs a *Confutation?* But was not the *Discipline calumniated*, which I noted a sufficient explication of your sense. 2. And here you *condensate* your *Untruths*: As first, That *there were but few who were not* then *tantum non Independants*, which the Age you live in knows to be *false.* 2. That I intimate, *that they are all of a sudden*

become *Presbyterians*, Because *Presbyterians* are a *part of them*: so *part* and *whole* are not distinguishable by the *Logick* of the *Gamaliels*, whose Instruction I mist of. When I have oft Published, that (besides *Scotland*, *Lancashire*, and *London*) I knew no great number of Ministers that received the *Presbyterian* Model: But almost all those in the County where you live (*Worcestershire*) Declared, that they agreed to joyn in the Practice of so much of *Church Discipline*, as the *Episcopal Presbyterians* and *Independents* were all agreed in; and on those grounds to unite for the promoting of the Peoples Instruction and Salvation, without dividing for the Controverted parts, or laying a greater stress on them, than there was cause for; yet here you have occasion to talk of the *transmutation of Elements*, &c.

§. 3. Here you want Conviction still! If so, I will not undertake to Convince you of any thing in the World which you are unwilling to know. Offer the case to an unconcerned Stranger, and take his Judgment. Tell him this *Truth* [Eighteen hundred *Ministers* are at once forbidden to *Preach Christ* according to their *Ordination Vow*: And when upon *that Dedication* they had alienated themselves from all other ways of Employment and Livelihood, they and their Families are cast upon *Alms* in a time of *extraordinary poverty*, except some of them that had somewhat of their own: None of all these are put out for *Ignorance*, *Insufficiency*, or any *Crime* or *scandal* at all; But for not *subscribing Assent* and *Consent* to all *things* (without exception) in Three Books written by men that profess that *General Councils* are

are *fallible*, even in *matters of Faith*: And for not declaring, that no man (that vowed it) is obliged to endeavour in his Place and Calling, any alteration of the *present Church Government* (which some think the *unsworn* as much bound to endeavour, as to *Reform* the worst *Alehouse* or *Tavern* in the Land: Especially whilst Lay-men Govern by the *Keys* of *Excommunication* and *Absolution*) And for not *swearing* and *unswearing*, *&c.* as is known, with such like things. These Men thus *ejected* and *silenced*, are forbidden, upon *severe Penalties*, Ecclesiastical and Corporal, to speak any thing in depravation of the Government of the *Church*, the *Liturgy* or *Ceremonies*, and under the *penalty* of *total ruine* in this World: To say that any man is bound by the *National Vow* to endeavour any alteration as aforesaid. A Law forbiddeth *Printers* to Print any unlicensed Book, upon penalty of losing all the *Copies*, *Paper*, and *Print*; besides, answering for all therein contained. The *Company* in *London* is called together, and constrained (as holding their *Charter* by *Patent*;) to make *Laws* also among themselves, That any man that Printeth an *unlicensed Book*, or *Leaf*, shall lose his *Freedom*, and become uncapable of their *Trade* (and so be utterly undone.) A *Conforming Minister* (for ends best known to himself) Writeth a Book called a *Perswasive to Conformity*, which containeth not the twentieth part of the *Argument* commonly before used by others; *Saravia*, *Hammond*, *Downame*, *Bilson*, *Burges*, *Fulwood*, *&c.*) which the *Non-conformists* are supposed to have studied: But *florid Oratorical*, *confident Calumnies*, most of the Book importing; an

Ignoratio Elenchi: And in this Book he vehemently urgeth one man particularly, that never saw him, nor meddled with him; to publish to the World, *An account of the Reasons of his Non-conformity.* This one man tells him, that no *Licenser* will *license* it: That he hath not Printed without *License*, before his importunity since the *Act*: That some few Printers through poverty have ventured on a few Sheets, which they could quickly slip out of the way. But now *severity* having encreased their *penalty*, he knoweth not of one man that will venture so far: That if they would, it will do him no good, who hath so much to say against *Conformity*, as a few sheets will not contain; and he knoweth not of that man living that would *Print*: And, that should he do it, he must look for such an *Imprisonment* as is likely to be his *death*: And therefore he thinketh that his *Time* and *Life* may be more usefully employed; especially when Experience assureth him, that such a Writing would passionately displease the *Prelates* of the *Church*, and such as call for it. And therefore that he did not ingenuously that clamoured thus for an account, when he knew that all these *Manacles* were on *our Hands*: Yet will not this man be convinced but his Clamour was reasonable and innocent, because in a few Sheets that accidentally had an advantage to *see the light*, (being both for the *Kings* and the *Churches Government*) he met with a few words which he thought were not to be licensed. And if this were published without License, it was most long of himself, since his foresaid *urgency*, no such thing being done before, nor do I know how to procure the like again.

This

This is the *true Case*; And now let any *sober Person*, *Christian*, or *Heathen*, judge between us, whether any thing could have *hardned* you into an *impossibility* of *Conviction*, but the great *averseness* to *Humiliation* and *Repentance*, and *selfish inclination* to be *righteous in your own eyes?* No wonder if no man be justified as *Legally innocent*, when a *bare Confession* of a deliberate *printed sin*, as visible as a *beam in the eye* (as Christ meant it) is so hardly obtained with some men: And (because *with what measure men meet, it shall be measured to them again.)* Wonder not if you meet with *Auditors* like *your self:* Suppose that *You* whose Office is to Preach Men to *Repentance*, do hear the *Perjured*, the *Drunkards*, *Blasphemers*, the *Fornicators* say, *This man is a Rayler, he drops smarting poyson upon us in his Sermons*; *When we hear him, we deal with a Woolf, and put our hands into a Hornets nest*; *bitterness and reviling is his Dialect*; *We are innocent, and all that he saith doth not convince us.* What would you say to such returns? But too many think that it is *their work to preach Repentance*, and other mens to *Repent*. As for *Magistrates forbidding faithful Ministers to preach the Christian Faith, where there are not enough more to do the Work:* Cannot you be content with the *Honour*, *Comfort*, and *Reward* of approving it, and suffer such to be without it, as refuse it. But when you say [*Alas, Church censures without the Magistrate* are but *brutum fulmen*] I will presume to tell you; 1. That you seem to me to come near to *Blasphemy*, to intimate that Christ ordained so vain a *Discipline:* What? and yet be the *Infallibe Teacher* and *King* of the *Church*. But

if

if you think that He did not Institute it, tell us so plainly, and pretend not more to an *unalterable Divine Institution*, which all of us must swear never to endeavour an alteration of. Or if you think that Christ did institute *Church Discipline* to be exercised, only when the *Sword* will second it; say so, that we may know your mind. And then 2ly, Do you not make the *Apostles* and the *Primitive Church* for above 300 years, to have abused the World with this *brutum fulmen*. If you talk of the *Apostles* power of seconding it by miraculous *Penalties*. I answer, 1. It cannot be proved that they did so *ordinarily*, but only *extraordinarily*. 2. All *Pastors* and *Churches* then had not that *power*, that yet were obliged to *exercise Discipline*. 3. The *Church* for 300 years had not that *power* every where. 4. And *Discipline* was to operate *propria virtute*, and not only by *Miracles*. So that you reproach the *Apostles*, and all the *ancient Churches*. 3. Do you not *reproach* all the *ancient Councils* and *Canons* of those times, as making such a stir in the World about a *brutum fulmen*. 4. Do you not reproach *Constantine*, and other Christian Emperors, who for a considerable time adjoyned not the *Sword* at all to the *Churches Keys*, except to remove some great *Patriarch* that had influence on the *State*; and long after did only force them to a *quiet submission* to the *Discipline*, without the addition of another *Penalty*, or constraining any to say, *they did repent*. How long was it before the *Church* took a man to be *meet for her Communion in the Lords Supper*, that had but rather say, *that he repented*, than have all taken from him, and lie in Prison. 5. Do you not here

tell

tell us what you *truſt* to, even the *Magiſtrates Sword* alone: And do you not diſgrace your *Cauſe* and *Function*, in telling the World in plain Engliſh, that *without the Sword, Prelatical Diſcipline* is but *brutum fulmen?* What then would your *Church* be, ſhould the *King* leave it only to an equal *Toleration* with all other *Parties*. 6. And do you not highly honour us *Non-conformiſts*, that deſire no greater matters, than *bare Leave to Exerciſe Chriſts Diſcipline without the Sword, on Volunteers*; we *would* have no more. If any have formerly deſired *more*, we diſown it. The *Scots* indeed *had more*, but when *Cromwell* left them but their *Liberty*, their *Diſcipline* proved not *brutum fulmen*. And truly I ſee not how thoſe few among them that are againſt the *Supremacy of the King*, *Circa ſacra*, if there be any ſuch, can expect any further *protection* or *help* by his *Sword*, than a *bare Toleration*. Let us but *Preach* and uſe this *brutum fulmen*, and then enjoy your *Lordſhips*, *Honours*, and all that is deſired. And why are you ſo greatly *afraid* of a *brutum fulmen* in our hands, when you confeſs it to be no better in your own.

§. 4. If you cannot ſee your *Contradictions*, repeating them will not open your Eyes. As for *Valentine* and *Orſon*, and *Knights Errant*, I give you the honour of being better acquainted with them, than I am. 2. And next you teach us, that according to your School, a *Queſtion may be falſe*. Well! ſo let it be, you ſhall there have the better alſo. I knew no more but that ſome kind of *Queſtioning* might imply a *Propoſition* which is falſe. But I will not ſtrive with you, if you are wiſer. The Queſtion was, [*How many of theſe Miniſters have*

have little more Learning than the English Books have taught them.] If this Question be false, *false* let it be: I cannot make it true, I would I knew what [*How many*] signifieth.

And what could I do more to detect your falshood, than Name you many that dwell about you, Seven neare you I named. And now (O the power of Innocency and worth) all those for their *Gravity, Sobriety, Learning and Peaceableness, you have as much esteem for as I can have*] And really I hope as bad as they, and their adversaries judge each other, were they all *better acquainted* with each other, the rest would constrain their afflicters themselves to such a praise and approbation, an inconsiderable number only excepted.

But who else should I name in the County where you live, and near you, Mr. *Joseph Baker*, Mr. *Benjamin Baxter*, Mr. *George Hopkins*, Mr. *Waldern*, *&c.* are dead. Those living are Mr. *Ambrose Sparrey*, (your predecessour at Hampton) Mr. *Andrew Tristram*, Mr. *Kimberley*, Mr. *Osland*, Mr. *Badland* of *Worcester*, Mr. *Sergeant*, Dr. *Richard Morton*, Mr. *Stephen Baxter*, Mr. *Richard Dowley*, Mr. *Cowper*, Mr. *Paston*, Mr. *Read*, I cannot remember all. Tell me how many and which of those you mean. The Elder about you dead, were on our side, Mr. *Arthur Salway*, Mr. *John Hall*, Mr. *Thomas Hall*, (your next Neighbour) Mr. *Smith* at *Dudley*, Mr. *Smith* at *Stoke*, (a younger Man) and not far of Mr. *Anthony Burgess*, Mr. *Blake*, *&c.* which of these mean you? And what if you can Name one unlearned Man, in Forty or Fifty. If he be but a *meer Nonconformist*, and not of some such Sect, with whom we have not much more affinity

affinity than with the *Papists* (who conform not, and yet say they are nearer to you than to us) I doubt, that *odd unlearned Man*, should he but conform, would be a great ornament to your present Church. But what course can one better take to silence such Calumnies, and to convince Posterity of such mens incredibility, than to *Name the persons round about*? How many hundred worthy men in *London*, and a few Counties of my acquaintance could I Name you. And you say, *it is a usual Stratagem with us, to possess particular persons with an opinion that you detract from them*: It is bad arguing *Syllogizare ex particulari*] Excellent *Logick!* He that condemneth the *Non-conformists*, and the *ejected Ministers* as meer illiterate, doth not condemn the *Individuals*, though it came in with an *How many*.] I never said, that you condemn them *all*; but I askt you, as you did me, *How many*: And is this like syllogizing *ex particulari*.] Do you intimate an Accusation against *Many of them*; and when I name almost all of that County neer you, will you *absolve them all*?

2. Next you say [*Those I intended have your suffrage*] Because I said [*I had rather have a meer English Divine, than an Hebrew or a Syriac Sot.* It seems you are of another mind: A *Sot* will serve to *preach Divinity*, and *seek mens salvation*. We *feel* the *judgment* of *more* than *you*; and this was enough to set you upon *blew Aprons*, &c. How forgot you *Tub-Preachers*?

3. And you would fain steal some honour to your self from the *Universities* as a *Defender of them*: O happy advantage! But who accused them? I said [*I am grown of late years to take it*

for

for no very great honour to our young Preachers, that they are acquainted with the Universities.] And you put [*It is*] for [*I take it*] and so I take it still. But *late years* signifieth not [*always*] nor [*our young Preachers*] *all* [*Preachers*. Doth he *that dishonoureth* the *University*, deserve *honour* for being at the *University?* What *young ones* you have I know not; but *our young ones* that I speak of, do not yet go about to change my mind. Do you think all those named (though he did not well) by the *Gloucester* Cobler *Ralph Wallis*, are an honour to the *University*, or *it* to *them:* I still take it for *no very great honour*, (I said not *none*) for any *ignorant*, *idle Lad*, to have been at the *University:* But sure I obtruded not this judgment on you or any other! Yet here is place for *Fanaticks slighting Learning*, *and the Universities*, *Corah's holy Congregation*, *eclipsing* the two *Luminaries*, *Agamemnon*, the *Sodomites*, and more such stuff. And shall it be the *Controversie*, whether you or I have written more for *Learning* and *Universities*; and which of us did more to save them from the *Anabaptists* and other *Fanaticks* when they were endangered? The visible Evidences shall decide the Case. You may be more *beholden* to the *Universities* than I; but I have done more than wish their *prosperity* as well as you. But *Quid-vis ex quovis* is your way. There went about Eleven or twelve out of *Kederminster* Parish and School to the *University* and *Ministry* in my time, and many since: If you please enquire of the difference.

3. And when you tell me, that *I deal no better with the Primitive Fathers*; I first ask you, how could

could you make ſhift to be ignorant how ill you uſe the ancient *Presbyters*, yea and *Biſhops* of the *Church* your ſelf? were they not moſtly *blew Aprons* with you, and ſuch as you diſdain for want of *Hebrew*, *&c.* Know you not that the *paucity* of Learned *Presbyters* was the true Cauſe that the few that were ſuch, got the place, and honour, and power of *Biſhops* above the reſt: And how few *Philoſophers* turned *Chriſtians* then? And how long it was before the *Chriſtians* had many conſiderable *Schools*, much leſs *Univerſities*? And what men the common *Presbyters* were; yea, and the *Biſhops* for the moſt part? *Alexandria* by *Pantænus*, *Clemens* and *Origen* kept up ſome competent Learning; *Baſil*, *Nazianzen*, *Niſſen*, *Chryſoſtom*, were fain to go to ſuch as *Libanius*, and to *Athens*; except thoſe forenamed, and *Juſtin Martyr*, and *Tertullian* before them, and *Hierom* after: how few either *Linguiſts* or *Philoſophers* had we: And yet do not you account thoſe holy and worthy men, *blew Aprons*, ſuch as *Ignatius*, *Polycarpus*, *Irenæus*, yea and *Cyprian*, almoſt all the Biſhops of *Rome*, *Græg. Neocæſar. Antonius*, *Ab. Pachomius*, *Macarius*; yea *Epiphanius* himſelf, *Ephrem Syrus*, *Iſidore Peleſiota*, *Ambroſe*, *Philaſtrius*, *Theoph. Alexand. Ruffinus*, *Gaudentius*, *Maximus*, *&c.* Beſides *Simeon Stillita*, and all the holy Famous *Monks*; yea *Auguſtinus* himſelf, the beſt rational Divine had little enough of the *Tongues*. Their Writings eaſily prove all this, with the Hiſtorical Deſcriptions of others concerning them.

I ſaid [*I think it ſo ſhort a Work to read the few brief Writers of the three firſt Centuries, as maketh it more a diſhonour to be ignorant of them, than any great honour*

honour to be acquainted with them.] Instead of this you feign me to say (*It is no great honour to be acquainted with them.*) But is this true? Is a Positive and a Comparative Assertion all one?] But it seems you are not of my mind: But take it for a *greater honour for a Minister to know them*, than a *dishonour to be ignorant of them:* And who vilified them more then you or I? If I say, that *it is a greater dishonour to be ignorant of the Alphabet, of the Grammar, of the Gospel*, than *honour to be acquainted with them*, so as to know what is in them; and you denied this, who vilified them most? Have you no greater matters than *these* to exercise your *censorious faculty* on: You know in how few months all the Writers of the three first *Centuries* may be read over. I pray you here leave every one to his liberty of judging: Among *you* it shall be a greater honour *to know them*, than a dishonour *to be ignorant of them:* Among *us* it shall be a greater dishonour *to be ignorant of them*, than an honour *to know them.* Could you endure any to differ from you, this Comprimize might serve: But the next time *falsifie* not my words. As for your intimation of some that *cannot read them*, do you not believe *your self*, that its true of *ten Conformists* for *one Non-conformist:* I remember but one *Non-conformable Minister* in *Worcestershire* that was not of an *University*, and I conjecture that he can read the *Fathers:* But by your speeches, what stranger would not take it to be used by you for their *ordinary Character*, which you durst not charge on *One by name* in all the County that is an *Ordained Minister* when I provoked you? Doth not this savour of *Factious malignity?* As to the *prepesse-*

tion

gus method of Reading late Writers before the Fathers, which you talk of: 1. *Papists* and *Protestants* in all *Universities* have most usually done so, as far as I can hear. 2. Some take both together. 3. I suppose that if one Book be read this Month, and another the next, it is not like to make any great alteration in knowledge which goeth first. 4. Methinks still you cross your own intention, and tell men that those *Non-conformists* honour the *Fathers* more than you; for the most judicious or necessary *Authors* should be read with greatest judgment, and *mature judgment* is usually the greatest. If you would have Boys learn the *Fathers* at *School*, as they do *Tully's Offices* before their larger *Catechisms*, they would be lost, as *Tully's Offices* usually is: And that which they have once read, though without judgment, they would think they need not read again. 5. Do you believe that Lads that never read any Method of *Theology* or *Catechism*, could draw a good *Catechism* or *Method* out of the *Fathers* first: suppose them to have begun at *Clem. Romanus*, and taken in *Dionis. Areop.* and *Ignatius*, yea, and *Martialis Apost.* at a venture, true or false, and to have ended at the *Nicene Council*, yea or any where short of *Augustine*: What a *Method* think you would they draw up? Yea if they must go further and read all *Chrysostom*, with his Enemy *Epiphanius*, and *Augustine* with his *Hilary*, *Prosper.* and *Fulgentius*, how would the Lads reconcile their *Doctrinal Disagreements*, and then draw one *Method* out of both *Parties*? 6. Do you not condemn the *Church of England*, which did not send men first to the *Fathers* for a *Method*, but drew them

up *Catechiſm* firſt, and then a *Book of Articles*, or *Confeſſion*, and *Nowell's Catechiſm* is Authoriſed by them, and then an *Apology*, and a Book of *Homilies*, *&c.* And commandeth not ſubſcription to the *Fathers*, but to theſe: And commanded no *Commentary* of the *Fathers* to be kept in the *Churches*, but *Eraſmus's Paraphraſe*. 7. And in good ſadneſs, can you that have read both, believe that the Writings of the *Fathers* are as *methodical*, as *accurate*, as *ſound*, as *full*, as *uſeful* to form a true Body of *Theology* in the Mind, as the *later Writers* are? Can you believe this? Is there any thing among them to theſe uſes, like *Melanthon's Loci Communes*, *Tzegedines Tables*, *Calvin's Inſt. Polanus*, *Ludov. Crocius*, *Georgius*, *Sohnius*, *Ameſius*, *Theſes Salmuenſes*, *Synopſ. Theol. Leidenſium*, *Camero*, *&c.* Or if you had rather like *Arminius*, *Epiſcopius*, Dr. *Hammond*, eſpecially like Biſhop *Andrews*, Dr. *Field*, Biſhop *Davenant*, *&c.* Are the beſt of their Practical Writings, even *Macarius*, *Ephrem Syrus*, *&c.* Comparable to abundance uſed now: Whether ſuch *Non-conformiſts* as *Hildersham*, *Perkins*, *Rogers*, *Burroughs*, *&c.* or ſuch *Conformiſts*, as *Sibbes*, *Preſton*, *Gurnal*, the *Practice of Piety*, *Hammond*, *&c.* Do you think that the ſureſt and readieſt way for Youth to come to underſtand and believe the *Doctrine of the Trinity*, of the *Godhead of Chriſt* and the *Holy Ghoſt*; of the *Hypoſtatical Union*, of the *twofold Nature and Will of Chriſt*, *&c.* is to read firſt, all the *firſt Writers* that ſay little or nothing of them, and thoſe that ſay much amiſs of ſome of them; and then to read all the odious Wars at the *Epheſine Council*, at the *Councils* of *Arimin. Sermium*, and many more. And

to read all the contentious Writings hereabout, of *Cyril Alexand*, *Theodoret*, *Epiphanius*, and down to *Damascene*. Is not one *Joshua Placaus pro deitate Christi*, worth all that ever was then wrote? I confess above all their Subjects, the times engaged them in the largest Defences of the *Christian Religion* against the *Heathens*; In which *Euseb. in Præparat. & Demonstrate. Evang. & Augustine* have done well: But so far short of what is done of late by *Grotius*, *du Plessis*, *Vander Meulin*, *Camero*, yea *Savonarola*, *Vives*, and many more; as that all laid together, I am not for your Method. Take out but *Justin*, *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian*, in the three first *Centuries*, and *Basil Nazianz. Nyssen*, *Hierom*, and *Chrysostom*, and *Augustin* after, and I will not tell you what you will leave us. If *Origen* must be taken in, let them first fight it out to decide it whether he be a *Hererick*: For *Halloix* and our Conforming *Originists* tell us, that *Theoph. Alexand.* and *Epiphanius*, ended not the *Controversie* by the *banishment* of *Chrisostom*. 8. And if all the *Navi* of the ancient Fathers, were in our *modern Divines*, which not only *Scultetus* and other *Protestants* have gathered, but even *Baronius*, *Sixtus Senensis*, *Possevine*, *Bellarmine*, *&c.* What would you call them? What *Hereticks* should we be? Was there ever so great Error charged on any one of the 1800 Ministers for their silencing, as is visible in *Dionys. Constitut. & Can. Apostol. Irenæus*, *Clem. Alex. Tatianus*, *Arnobius*, *Lactantius*, *&c.* But I forgat how much *Dalæus de usu Patr.* hath said more on this Subject. If we had to do with Men that could let men live by them, that obey them not, even in the method of their

Studies, this much also might compremise this difference. You shall set your *Pupils* first to read all the *Fathers*, and make out of them such a *Religion* as they are able, or perhaps *too many*: (But then *you* must not be their *Collector* as you teach them; for 'tis as good to take a *Method* from a *Book*, as from *your Mouth*:) And *We* will teach *Ours* first to understand the *Catechisms*, *Ursine*, *Polane*, *Amesius*, &c. with the *Scriptures*, and to read the *Fathers* in order, when they have *judgment* to know how to use them, and let the *issue* shew which is the *wiser way*. But I pray you while you read the *Fathers* to your *Scholars*, call them not *blew Aprons*, nor *Tub-Preachers*, nor *Fanaticks*, as oft as you find them to have wanted the *Languages*, or *Academical Education*, lest it hinder your success.

But I think all this quarrel with the *Method* of our *Studies*, is for the Interest of *Diocesan Prelacy*; Therefore to save us any more trouble, we will refer all that *Controversie* to your own *Ignatius* alone, (who determineth, *That in every Church there is one Altar, and one Bishop, with his Presbyters and Deacons*) and with that we are content. In your *Page* 6, to keep your wont; 1. You feign me to say, that which I tell you is objected to me by others. 2. You falsly feign me to allow the *Conformists* to have some *Hebrew*, *Chaldee*, *Syriac*, and *Arabic*, my very mention of which words you oft lay hold on, as an Honour granted to your *Side*: But it is all a false supposition, I never applyed those words to the *Conformists*: I only told you, that (valuing *Matter* before *Words*) *I had rather the Church had men that speak sound Doctrine*

Etrine in an apt and ſerious manner, for bringing Sinners to repentance in Engliſh, than ſuch as can lace an inſipid, empty, ſenceleſs Diſcourſe, with ſome ſhreds of Chaldee, Syriac, or Arabic: and though I could wiſh that all the Miniſters of Chriſt had all Accompliſhments fit even for the adorning of their sacred Work; yet I had rather hear a meer Engliſh Divine, than an Hebrew or a Syriac Sot.] You put me to the troubleſom repeating of my words, by your falſification. I did not mention *Conformiſts* at all, nor had any thought of appropriating theſe Paſſages to them any more than others: But only to tell you, that be he *Conformiſt* or *Non-conformiſt*, if like *Auguſtine*, *Ambroſe*, *&c.* he had *found Divinity without the Languages* now mentioned, I could better bear with him, than with one (whoever) that had *Words* for Oſtentation without *Senſe*; and to free you from all ſuſpicion of Injury, I *never heard one* of the *young Conformiſts* which I mention, make any oſtentation or credible ſignification of his skill in any one of thoſe *Tongues:* Nor do I remember but exceeding few *Conformiſts* in *England* of my acquaintance, that I will accuſe or ſuſpect of any ſuch skill: But having a Lad in my houſe not long ago come from School, who hath ſome acquaintance in all theſe *Languages*, and as many more, who I aſſure you is too young to be a *Conformable Preacher*, or *Divine*, he being next me, ſuggeſted the Matter of my Compariſon, when you vilified I know not whom (ſome unnamed) *Non-conformiſts*, for knowing little more than *Engliſh Books* can teach them. One *Preſſick* a Sadler in *Leverpool* hath written *That* againſt ſome of your *Sect* in *Engliſh*,

which all their *Languages* will hardly enable them to Confute: And I hear but few of you that in *real knowledge*, are much more Angelical than *Aquinas*, ſubtle than *Scotus*, profound than *Bradwardine*, *&c.* when yet they and their *Scholaſtick Tribe* were commonly very ſorry *Linguiſts*. But its needful that I intreat you, that you affirm me not to have called them all *Non-conformiſts*, becauſe I name them in this Compariſon.

As for the *loads* of *Dirt* that you ſay I caſt, and your ſaying, that you *ſee* (you ſhould have ſaid *feel*) *that its difficult to forbear reproach towards them from whom we differ.*] I anſwer; 1. And I ſee that its no wonder if that *Tribe* who think themſelves *perſecuted*, when they may not *perſecute* and *ſilence others*, do alſo think themſelves *reproached*, when others are juſtly vindicated from their *reproach*. 2. But its hard, that as *Tranſubſtantiation* muſt be an *Article* of ſome mens *Faith*; ſo we alſo muſt be obliged to believe, that all our *Senſes* and *Experience* are deceived: And that he that walketh in the *Froſt* is a *reproach* for ſaying it is *cold*, becauſe another affirmeth that the *Summer is colder*, becauſe of now and then a *rainy day*. Alas, are ſo many great *Chappelries*, and many *Pariſh Churches* in ſeveral parts of the *Land*, utterly without any *Miniſter* at all; Are ſo many others ſo ſupplied (yea ſo many hundreds) as the *Lovers* of *Souls* do *groan* and *weep for*; and muſt we neither *ſee* nor *feel it*? But, Sir, if we muſt not *feel it to you*, let us *feel it to God*, that we may *feelingly* and not *formally* pray *him* to ſend forth *more* and *better Labourers into his Harveſt*. For my part, I ſeriouſly profeſs, that if the *Goſpel* be

but

but better *Preached*, and the *Souls* of all the *Pa-riſhes* in the *Three Kingdoms* better *inſtructed* for their *Salvation*, without *us*, than with *us*, I will never more ſpeak for a *Liberty to Preach*, much leſs deſire a *Farthing* of the *Maintenance*.

But, Sir, if you talk in *Print* as you do to *me* in *private Letters*, you might make *ſtrangers of your Mind*; But to the People of the preſent Age, that *ſee*, that *hear*, that *know the Perſons*, your *words* will be all *vain:* You may call them the *Children of Hell* for not believing you, but men are ſo *naturally ſenſible*, that your *Anger* will not change them neer *London*, and in it I think are the *worthieſt Conformiſts* in the *Land* (proportionably) And yet how many places not far off *it*, *feel* what I ſay. A worthy Learned, judicious, peaceable *Divine* (bred up in one of the next Pariſhes to you awhile) Mr. *John Warren*, is *ſilenced* at a *great Town*, *Hatfield Broadoak* in the Biſhop of *London*'s *Preſentation:* Thus he hath long lived and done *much good*, yet ſince 1662 that he was *ſilenced*, the *Place* hath been void many years, becauſe the *Maintenance* is *ſmall*; and there muſt be *none at all*, rather than ſuch a one as *He*. But you call this *caſting Dirt too:* The *ſtarved Souls* muſt not take on them to *feel their Caſe*; And to be *paſt feeling* in ſuch *caſes*, is a *ſtate* that men are prone to of themſelves; and need no *Preachers* to help them to be *indifferent* in. Well! *Souls* muſt be *ſtarved*, or not be *humble*. [How can we *prefer others before our ſelves*] unleſs we will be content that *thoſe for whom Chriſt died* be neglected, and *Ignorance* ſet up to teach men *knowledge*, and the *Ungodly* to teach them *Godlineſs*. But as in *Na-*

time, so in *Grace* there is a *Principle* that will not suffer men by *Words* to be brought to take *Famine* for *Food*, nor saying a *dry Lesson*, for teaching men the *Way to Heaven*: Blessed be God that hath *possessed* all *renewed Christians* with a *new Nature*, which differenceth the *Chaff* from the *Wheat*, and *words* from real *worth* and *substance*. But you heard a *Preacher* say, *That he thanked God he never heard a Preacher, but he could get something by him. Answer*, And I also am of Mr. *G. Herbert*'s mind, *Church-porch*, *p.* 15. [*If all want sense, God takes a Text and preacheth Patience.*] But for all that, I will not by my *Approbation* contract the *Guilt* of such *Preachers*, nor of *those* that set them up, and would have others *silenced* and *calumniated*, and then plead *Humility* for the *valuing* of these. Every Text that is *preached on*, is *edifying*; and I hope by bare *reading it* we may be *edified*: And in *Muscovy* where all *Preaching* is put down for fear of *Treason*, 1671. and yet now by *Treason* they are just between *Life* and *Death*) they seem to have great advantage in the using of your *Argument*, to tell them that would have *Preaching*, that *Humility* should teach them to esteem the *Readers labour* above their own. And truly *Basil* and *Chrysostom*'s Sermons which they read, are better than the Sermons in very many Churches in this *Land*, (which you that honour the *Fathers* its like will not deny:) But cheat not your self so as to *dream* that we are the *Assailants*, when we meddle not with you but by way of Comparison, when urged to it in our own defence. But because *Prejudice*, and *Factious passages*, *yellow Jaundices*, a *Party*, *&c.* are here *accused*, I could almost find in my heart

heart to ſend you a *Copy* of ſome of the *Sermons* that I have lately heard; But you would but pretend that this were ſome rare unuſual thing. O let the World take heed what *Hiſtory* they believe; I have as much ado to perſwade you, that many *Churches* are left in a caſe which calls for *Tears*, as I have to perſwade *Bagſhaw* and others on the other *extream*, that *any of them have worthy or tolerable men:* When yet many *hundred thouſand Perſons* have *Senſe*, *Reaſon*, and *Experience* to decide the Caſe. But theſe *ten years experience*, and much more, have taught me, not *haſtily to believe a Faction*, though in *a matter* where the *common ſenſe* is Judge: for *Faction* is one of the *greateſt Lyars* in the world.

But you ſay [*Juſt ſo did* Martin Marprelate *traduce the regular Clergies. Anſwer*, Juſt ſo, is *juſt untruly* ſpoken by you. As well may the *Papiſts* ſay to the *Lutherans*, *Juſt ſo did the Heriticks of old:* Rather juſt ſo did Chriſt tell ſome men, That they *took away the Key of Knowledge*, *and would neither enter*, *nor ſuffer others.* And juſt ſo he told them, That if *the blind lead the blind*, *both will fall into the Ditch.* One of the laſt Sermons I heard, was on [*Servants obey your Maſters in all things:*] and our own Servants being almoſt wholly paſt by, it was applied to ſhew, *That we are Servants to the Biſhops*, *and muſt obey them in all things:* As if *ſubjection* without *ſervitude* had not been enough. One of the next before it, was to prove, That the *Church may appoint Holy-days*, *becauſe Eaſter-day* (which is the *Lords-day*) *is a Holy-day of the Churches appointment:* When moſt of the people had more need to have been taught

the

the *Cathechistical Principles*, and, what *they did* when they were *Baptized*. I can name you the *Man* (and *Place*) that from the *Title* of *John's* Epistle [*To the elect Lady*] proved undeniably that then there were *Lord Bishops*, *because an Elect Lady relateth to an Elect Lord*, and *there are no Elect Lords, but Elect Lord Bishops*. And if such as you are pleased to approve of the *silencing of many hundreds*, yea of such as *Amesius*, *Cartwright*, *Greenham*, *Hildersham*, *John Rogers*, *Egerton*, *Dod*, *Bradshaw*, *Rob. Parker*, *Paget*, *Hering*, *&c.* (O what men) and the setting up of such as *These*, or *Readers* in their stead, all is salved by telling us, that *we must think others better than ourselves*, and that *we may profit by all*. And if God did work by all alike, *sense* or *non-sence*, and made as much use of the *Ignorant* and *Ungodly* to procure *Knowledge* and *Godliness* in the world, I would say as you. I believe with K. *James* they have an *ill Spirit*, that recount *Grievances* to make themselves *popular*; (I suppose Sir *Edw Sands* named by you, was one he meant so ill do your Allegations agree) But I will not therefore consent to their Guilt that *make grievances*, and then declaim against such *Popularity*. *They please not God and are contrary to all mens forbidding us to Preach to the Gentiles that they might be saved, for Wrath is come upon them to the uttermost*, was this Popular declaiming against grievances? Deny your *Children* Food and Rayment, and then call them such *Popular declaimers*.

Again you snatch at your former self-deceiving fiction, [*did these Hebrew Children* and *Arabick Lads, come out of your School, they should have been stroaked*

stroaked for Precious Youthes] *Answer*, How pleasing to you is a selfmade Cheat. Realy Sir, I know not one such Lad that is a *Conformist*, your urgency may possibly provoke me to, send you if it please you, some of our homebred Fruits, to tell you whence I fetcht my comparison. 1. (when you *well mourn for your Alehouses Sots*, and yet say, *that all our* 1800 *are not free*) your *Confession* on one part is constrained, your *Accusation* on the other side I think is a *Calumny*. 1. Because no one of all the *Non-conformists* was cast out for *Drunkenness*, but many on the other side were cast out upon *Accusation* of that sin, seconded by Oathes, (how just I must not presume to say) 2. I that know the *Non-conformists* better than you, know not one Drunkard amongst them all in *England*. 3. I Challenge you to Name one of all the *Ministers* I Named to you, or any other in the County of *Worcester* where you live.

Next, (*Page* 7.) you pretend that I *Change my judgement in valuing the Common Prayer and Homilies*,] Answer, all false still, no change at all. I ever valued the *Common Prayer* and *Homilies* much before such Preaching as I described to you. And realy I think that the *Non conformists* much more value the *Homilies*, than the *Conformists* do.

Next, I am glad that you disclaim the proving it of *any of our Non conformists in England*, that he *was silenced* for *Insufficiency*. But was this *impertinent* to one that intimated such Charges of unlearnedness as you did. But, you say *it is of another Nature (the reason of our silence) that we do not give security to Authority: that we will Preach up no more Wars*, Answer, I summon your Conscience to justify you

silencing

silencing of so many and such, in the necessity of so many Thousand Souls, one moment after death, upon the Charge now given us on these reasons. 1. I told you, and you could not deny it, that if you leave out your Oath and Subscription to the *Bishops* and *Chancellors*, with the Vast Assent, and Consent, few *Non-conformists* will refuse the renunciation mentioned by you about Wars. Yet still have you that front to lay it upon this. The many that took the *Oxford* Oath upon this, and the more that were ready to take it, if Judge *Keeling* had not presently and openly declared it to be a renunciation of the National Vow. 2. I again provoke you to prove that there is one *Non-conformable Minister* of Ten or Twenty, that ever was proved, or can be, to have medled with the War against the King, 3. you read and cite my late Writing, wherein I say (*Page* 51. *Differ.* of the *Pow* of *Mag.* and *Past.*) *I ascribe all that power to Kings which is given them by any Text of Scripture, or acknowledged by any Council General, or Provincial, or by any Publick Authentick Confession of any Christian Church, either Protestant, Greek, or Papist, that ever I yet saw.*) And is all this Insufficient to a Liberty to Preach Christ to ignorant Souls, must *Protestants*, *Greeks*, and *Papists*, be all silenced for want of Loyalty? I will subscribe to the utmost, that which any of their Confessions give to Kings, 4. The *Non-conformists*, (so far as I am acquainted with them,) have still been ready in express terms to promise never to meddle in any War against the King; Nay to promise to employ their interest, and labour to prvent it. If this would serve, they should not be silenced, Are such as *Hooker* and *Bilson* thought worthy of *Ho-*

nour, and are these *Principles of ours* so much less security against War, as to leave us on that account uncapable to Preach. Let but reason and humility be judge of your Accusation and Cause. And here to shame your self, yet more *Marchiamont Need-hams Book*, is instanced in. A Man that is no Minister but a Physician: who in those daies Wrote against us *Non-conformists*, and against *my self by Name*, when the generality of the now silenced *Non-conformists*, and (excluding the Sectaries) stood, out refusing for the most part the engagement whom the Royalists of my vicinity took it. This Man that Wrote against me, and since the Kings return, hath welcomed him in florid Poems: is instanced in to tell Men what the *Non-conformists* are, and why they are silenced. Truly Sir I conjecture you are a Stranger to them, (as abundance of the Prelatists are) though you lived in *England*, and have dwelt somewhere where you knew but some Giddy Sectaries, and judge by them of those you knew not. And here *(Page 8.)* I am glad that you deny not, that the *worst among us are received, if they do but conforme*, which sheweth for what crime we are kept out. And for your exclamation against us that come not in, you would be impatient if I should but describe your dealing, What if you lived under in such a power of Usurpers as would say [if all the Ministers in *Germany Holland &c.* will under their hands, or delibrately profess, that no one in the Kingdom is bound by the Oath of Supremacy or Allegiance, and promise that he will never endeavour the reformation of any Corruption in Religion, but will Assent and Consent to every Word in the *Interim*, and will

use

uſe Exorciſm, &c. they ſhall have leave to Preach elſe they ſhall all be ſilenced and deprived of a Miniſterial Liberty and maintenance.] And the *Caſſander* ſhould have told them, that they ſhut out themſelves if they come not in. I ſay not that our Caſe is the ſame with this. I know it is not. But *Caſſander* dealt more Candidly than you do. Is there any thing that could be impoſed, that would make you a *Non-conformiſt?* If there be might non any Man talk to you at ſuch rates, even tye your Legs, and intreat you to go: or blind fold you, and ſay, read who ſtruck you.

§. 6. What need you more to the preſent Caſe, when you ſay that *there is never a Cherubim to hinder them*, than this, that though it be no ſin in your Opinion, it is a hainous ſin in theirs.? And will your Opinion prove it, where we ſearch as diligently as you do to know the truth: If we be not as good as you, you may allow us to love our ſelves as well. Tell me what time of any Uſurpation had ſuch impoſitions, which the main Body of the preſent *Conformiſts* then in being, did not conform or ſubmit to, or which they refuſed to the Coſt of all their Church maintenance (for the liberty of Preaching, too many of them could eaſily forego it) I know that many were *turned out by others*, that would gladly have conformed, if that would but have been accepted. I knew not three Men in the three Counties about me, that would not then have conformed, if that would have kept them in their livings. If there were more unknown to me there or elſewhere, I would but have asked thoſe men, whether it *was a ſin* that was *impoſed* on them: And if ſo, whether it would have prevailed with them

if one had done as you, and told them that they kept out themselves, and that no *Cherubin* stood in the way, and how hainously they sinned in forsaking their *Calling*. It seems by your Complaint of the *Tryers* (men that I had nothing to do with) that either you did Conform then (or would have done, if they had not refused you:) They say you did Conform. I am sure that most of my Acquaintance that were sequestred, would have Conformed to have kept their *Livings:* But if we be of another mind now, when *Declarations*, *Subscriptions*, *Oaths*, and *Practices* are imposed on us; which——————what would you have us to do? Our manifold *Interests* obligeth us to judge them *lawful* if we could: We lose as much by not Conforming, as most of you get by Conforming. Must we judge all *lawful*, because our *Guides* do so? How far will that hold? Will it hold in *Italy*, or in *France*, or in *Denmark*; or formerly in *Scotland* if you had lived there? He that must take all for *good*, which another calleth so, must know who it is, that is so far to be *trusted on*; especially of those that renounce *Infallibility*.

2. The *Irony* was palpable enough to have prevented your Fancy, that *I give up the Cause*, scil. *by confessing the Crime that we sought to save Souls*, and that *we did eat bread*. A little will encourage you sometimes to *great Conclusions*.

§. 7. *P.* 9. Here you have many things to say, to prove that men that came into *Sequestrations*, either *sought not*, or *procured the good of Souls:* But O! first remember, that if *that* were *true*, yet all those (or neer all) were turned out of their *Sequestrations* before the *silencing Bartholomew Day*, 1662.

Do

2. Do you think that it had been as consistent with the *good of Souls*, that they had for *sixteen years* been all *untaught*, and left without any *Ministers*, or *Publick Worship*, rather than any should have succeeded the *ejected*. 3. If our *Preaching* did no *good to Souls*, why should you think that yours does any? If you preach the same *Gospel*, why should you think so well of your *own works* above *other mens?* And if yours also do *no good*, why do men pay their *Tythes*, and trouble themselves to hear such as do but trouble the World. 4. Do you not Conspire with the *Quakers* that falsly cried out that our Ministry did not profit men; and with the *Levellers*, that would have taken down the Ministry as unprofitable. 5. But O! what an attempt you make to prove how little *History* is credible, to teach men to say, How know we that *Hegisyppus*, that *Eusebius*, that *Socrates*, that *Epiphanius* say true, when such men as should be the *Preachers of Truth*, can say what they do of *common* or *notorious matters of Fact*; yea and confidently stand to it, to the face of that Age which knoweth that they speak falsly. 1. Who are more *competent Judges*, whether men *recived any good by Christs Gospel which we preached* you or they. Do you know the Hearts and Lives of many hundred thousands better than they do themselves: I know many are deceived with *self-flattery*, but are you that are a *stranger* to their *hearts* and *them*, the fittest *Judges*. Do you better know what *Faith*, *Hope* and *Love* what *Repentance* and *Obedience* the *Gospel* hath produced. To instance among *strangers*, is the way of *darkness* or *evasion*; I may speak boldliest where I know best.

beſt. Ask the People of *Kederminſter*, whether in that time they received any good by the *Goſpel:* Know you not, that when ſome ſuch did but preach to them at the rates you now talk, it ſo alienated their minds from *Prelacy* and *Conformity*, who before were not ſo averſe thereto, as that they have put it paſt my power to reconcile them ſo far to them as I am reconciled my ſelf; and were not my intereſt very great in them, and their Preacher very honeſt, I ſhould not get them to come to *Church:* Such good the *Spirit* of *Envy* and *Faction* doth in the World, while it pretendeth to heal the hurt that others do. 2. Let the effects that are viſible be *judge*; if places that abounded with *Rioting*, *Drunkenneſs*, *Ignorance*, and *Ungodlineſs*, do now ſearch the *Scriptures* and meditate with *delight in the Law of God*, and conſtantly worſhip him, and their *Families call upon his Name*, if they live *ſoberly*, *righteouſly*, *and godly*, *forſaking the former luſts of their ignorance*, *and ſeek firſt the Kingdom of God and his righteouſneſs*, *and live in charity and peace*; will it prove that theſe People are never the better, becauſe *Faction* cauſeth a *ſtranger* to tell them ſo. But you ſay [*They were not the Souls of every Soil*, *ſuch as did inhabit poor Villages*, *but ſuch as dwell in fatteſt Parſonages*, *or elſe in great Towns*, *where theſe men who were moſt for the good of Souls*, *might act their parts*, *&c.*] *Anſwer.* Farwel the *credit of all Hiſtory*, if there be no *truer Hiſtorians:* (But how ſhall *Poſterity* know who they are?) Is there an *Engliſh-man* that can be ignorant that the endeavour then was that no *Church* might be unſupplied. There is no talking a far off, was not Mr. *Cowper* at *Moſeley*

Chappel near you, Mr. *Rock* at *Rowley*, Mr. *Tristram* at *Clents*, Mr. *Walderne* at *Broom*, Mr. *Baldwin* at *Chadsley*, Mr. *Sergeant* at *Stone*, Mr. *Baldwin* at *Wolverley*, my Assistant at *Mitton Chappel*, Mr. *Lovel* at *Alveley*, &c. Doth not all the Country about you know, that this which you say is *false*: And are you then to be believed in difficult *moral Cases* of *Duty* or *Sin*, who deny *publick fact* which all the Country about you knoweth. Go into any one of these *Churches*, and tell them that these men were never their *Preachers*, and try whether you can convert them to believe you. 2. But that the *great Towns* (which commonly had least *Maintenance*) should be first provided for: That *Tribe* of *Men* should not deny, who hold that none but *Cities* of old had *Churches* and *Bishops*, nor should have *Bishops* to this day. Nor should they teach Enemies to say, *These Bishops settled themselves only in the great Cities to act their parts with most popularity*. Is that the reason of your remove to *Hampton*. 3. But what were the *parts they had to act?* Their *work* it self is the best *evidence* of that. Let the *two Printed Agreements* of the *Worcestershire Ministers*, one for *Discipline*, and one for *Catechising* and personal *instruction*, with my *Reformed Pastor*, be a *standing Witness* to *Posterity*, what the Countries Ministers work was, against all *factious Calumny*: We lived not idle; not one of a multitude had an *hundred pounds a year Maintenance*, that I could know of. In my great place (of *Sequestration*) mine was less, when I was elsewhere oft offered above *Three hundred pounds*; we preached twice or thrice a week, and rarely meddled with any

Con-

Controverſies, except againſt the *Quakers*, and *Anabaptiſts*, when they came to trouble the *Churches*: We ſpent half two days a week in Conference with each Family, to *Catechize* them, and help them to underſtand the *Catechiſm*, and to prepare them for another World. Beſides all our *Labour of Diſcipline*, to bring the *Scandalous* to *Repentance*, and all the other Offices of our places. In the laſt Leaf of my [*Diverſal Concord*] the practice of the *Church* where I lived is recited. This was the *Part we acted for our ſelves*. 2. But you add [*What good was done to Souls by theſe Intruders, late Poſterity will find, &c. Anſwer*, 1. I think that the *preſent Age* that hath the Experience may better know than *Poſterity*, unleſs they have *truer Hiſtorians* than you. 2. Many *thouſand Souls* already in *Heaven*, and *many thouſand* more yet on *Earth*, that were brought to the true knowledge of God and themſelves, by the *Labours* of ſuch *Miniſters*, will be their *Witneſs* what *good* they did. But the *Stranger* meddleth not with their *Joys*. 3. If you impute to them either the *Errors* or *Work* of *Sectaries*, whom they were the principal means of ſuppreſſing, and whom they did much more againſt than you: Or yet the *Works* of the *Rebellious Souldiers*, that pulled down *Powers*, and ſet up *themſelves*; you will but ſhew your *malignity* and *unrighteouſneſs*: If you do not, your *Accuſation* ſignifieth nothing. If you mean that the People will not be brought to like *ſilencing* of *Prelats* better than ſuch *Preachers*; and this is the breach which the skilfulleſt of you cannot heal, I am of your mind: And the Names of *Intruſion* and *Schiſm* will not ſerve to change their

Minds. As for *Intrusion*, I knew very few such in those days that ever came to a place before they were sought to and intreated; And I know very few now that are not *Seekers*. 3. Your next, against *Preaching down Authority and Plundering other mens Livings to save Souls*, sheweth more what *you are*, than what *they did*: When you know that I have provoked you to name one of ten or twenty that ever preached down *Authority*, or meddled with Arms; Most coming out of the *Universities* after the Wars, and many never meddling with them (though several *Conformists* did.) And sure the Party is not to be judged or denominated by a tenth or twentieth part. I named many men to you in the former Paper, and in this: Enquire how few of all those ever meddled with Arms. 2. And those few that did, almost all did it before they came into *Sequestrations*, and many never did so after; and thought it had been *Authority* which they had stood for: And as he that erreth in Medicine upon the judgment of a *Colledge of Physicians*, so he that erreth in *Law* upon the judgment of a *Parliament*, is more pardonable than some other men, and may again be capable of Preaching the Gospel, or else such should not now be readmitted. 3. And, if *eating the Bread of Preachers be it you call plundring other mens livings*, their *Error* if it were one, had these excuses, that they thought that the Tythes had been first devoted to God, and that he was the first proprietor, and that they were determinately devoted to him for this use, to maintain a lawful Minister there to officiate: and they thought that when the then Ruling Parliament had cast out some

under

under the Notion of *Insufficient* and *Scandalous*, it was lawfull nevertheless for others to keep up a Church, and teaching, and Worship of God, and therefore to Eat the Dedicated Bread. And as for the turning out of any for the Kings Cause, that were not utterly *Insufficient* or *Drunkards*, or such like, we Printed our judgment against it; and many would not succeed such men, which gave advantage to some that were Sectarians to succeed them. And what got the People by that scruple? As for the fifth part, you know it was ordinarily paid, (and now nothing) and, Mr. *Lea*'s Book made no alteration. Your talk of medling with Temporals, *in ordine ad spiritualia*, is a meer impertinency. But if you ask Bishops, and Chancellors, whether it be lawfull to meddle with spiritual things, *in ordine ad temporalia*, (yea and Priests too) it will be a seasonable question, (if set home.) I am glad to read that they did but threaten to silence you. By which I perceived you were not then so scrupulous as to lose all, to escape Conformity to those times. And I also was threatned to be silenced as well as you: and virtually sequestred by an Order against such as would not keep their Fasts, and Thanksgivings, and that spake against their Authority (which I openly did) and that would not take the Engagement: and yet I was never silenced by them, (but only as to one Assize Sermon,) that work being fitter for Men, whose proper Office it is, and that *jure divino*. And my life was frequently threatned by the *Souldiers*, as well as yours. But I must [*tell you truly, should I reassume my Chair, would I continue in this Courteous Mood.*] *Ans.* You have proved already, that a Question

may be false, may you not as easily prove that it may be Malignant, 1. What is my Chair? Had I any but the Pulpit, or Reading place, at *Kedermin*ſter, 2. Why do you question my Courteſie, when I both *Printed my deſires and reaſons, againſt hindring any worthy Men from Preaching the Goſpel*, upon pretence of the Cauſe of the King or Prelacy heretofore, and when I have in Three or Four Books this very Year, maintained the ſame Impartiality and Principles. Yea moſt of all my Writings and Preaching for 25 Years have been much againſt Faction: and for the Union, Concord, and Concurrence of all Miniſters and Chriſtians, who are agreed but in Chriſtianity it ſelf, and the Eſſentials of Church Communion, in carrying on Gods Work with mutual forbearance. And when I never had a hand in putting any ſuch men out, and have kept many of your Party in: What room after this for ſuch a Queſtion? Next you carp at me, for telling you (in refutation of your *Calumnies* by a *Compariſon*) what Miniſters were in my time, and in the Places where I lived: You [*marvel at my* Præcox ingenium, *that could judge before I was ten years old, Who were ignorant, Who learned Preachers: You fear it is ſtill the greateſt part of ſome mens Devotion to cenſure the Parts and Gifts of the Preacher,*] *Anſwer*, O what relief are poor Souls like to have from ſuch uncompaſſionate Shepherds! I conjecture you believe me not, I will do what I can to cure you. But remember, I open not my Fathers Nakedneſs, while I ſpeak nothing but what *Congregations* law and heard; and that to you alone now in ſecret, and that upon your urgency. I was not bred in *Wales* nor *Ire-*

land,

land, but first in *Shropshire*. At six and seven years old my first Master was a *Reader*, never at *University*, and Preached once a Month: I name him not, because he was allied to me, and mended. My next Master Mr. *Heyward* was a Lay-man, publickly read the *Common Prayer*, but never Preached, but proved after an honest *Lay-man*, though no *Scholar*. My next Master, Mr. *Cope*, Read and never Preached. My next Master, Mr. *Yale*, *B. D.* Preached once a Month, and drank himself, Wife and Children, to be stark Beggars. These at *Rowton*: And still note that we had no other. I then came to live at *Eaton Constantine*; the *Vicar* of the *Parish*, Mr. *Richard Wolley*, never Preached: The *Parson* of the *Town*, Sir *William Rogers*, above fourscore, had *two Livings*, and never Preached in his life, as was said: When his Eye-sight failed him, he said *Common Prayer* by Memory; and *John Colly* a Day-labourer, one year, and *Thomas Gaynam* a Taylor, another year read the Scriptures, but none Preached. Having two Places, when he was absent, his Curate was first, his Son *Francis Rogers*, rarely if ever Preached; a famous *Stage-player*: (One of his Sports was on the open Stage, to let his *Pudenda nudata per restem laceratam quasi neglecta se ostentare ad risum populi movendum.* His next *Curate*, my Master *John Rogers* (his Grand-child) was unlearned and never Preached. His next *Curate*, *Richard Batboe*, was a Lawyers Clerk, broken by drinking, who was wont, to our smart, to let us know when he was drunk; and never Preached there but once, which was in my hearing when he was drunk, as I told you: If he be not lately dead, he is yet a Mini-

ſter very near you at *Patſhill*. In the ſame Village another Neighbours Son turned Prieſt, Mr. *Thomas Rock*, who being detected to be vicious, and have forged Orders, fled: So much for our Pariſh *(Leighton.)* The next Eaſtward, *Bildwas*, had a Miniſter that never Preached; nor could I learn that ever they had before a Preacher ſince the *Reformation*. The next to that was *Madeley*, whoſe Miniſter preached not, and was as famous for Debauchery, as the Madmen of *Madeley* for Folly. On the other ſide us, the next Church *Creſſage* had no Preaching. The next *Kenley*, had Mr. *Bennet* a Reading Curate, that Preached not. Mr. *Bent* at *Harley*; my Kinſman Mr. *Wood*, *B.D.* at *Cund*, ſeldom: And the ſame I may ſay of too many other Places round about us. At *Kedermiſter* Mr. *Dance* Preached (as ſome call'd it) once a Quarter, or Half-year: Mr. *Turner* at *Miſton*, ſometime (when ſober) once a day, of whom I told you, that I knew by Examination, his intollerable Ignorance of the *Creed*. At *Dowles* our foreſaid Sir *William Rogers* was Parſon. In the two Chappels in the *Rock* Pariſh (which I confeſs had ſmall Maintenance) one Reading Curate made Ropes for his living, and another cut Faggots. I will add no more; and this is only private to your ſelf: to excuſe my ſelf and the poor people, who you think [*place our Devotion in judging of the Miniſters Parts.*] Alas, poor Souls! Into ſuch hands are you fallen: The Lord be more merciful to you, than ſuch *Paſtors*; who if for *Bread*, they give you a *Stone*, will reproach you as *Cenſurers of your Teachers*, if you find fault: And when the firſt Work needful *to ſave Sinners*,

is to awaken them to a care of their own Souls, and a love to Teaching; ſome men are angry with them, if they will care whether they are *taught* or *untaught*. Of all Merchandize, I love not making Merchandize of Souls. But I pray you dream not, that I take all the *old Miniſtry* for ſuch as theſe? I know there are many *excellent men*: But I think the preſent *Non-conformiſts* as fit for the *Sacred Office* as theſe; (Is that preſumption?)

§.10.*p.*10. I thank you for your *tranſitions* and purpoſed *brevity*: To requite you; 1. Your firſt *Paragraph* doth but ſay in effect, 1. That you untruly ſuppoſe me to meddle with the *Controverſie*, which I do but wiſh for leave to meddle with. 2. And that you think many things good, which I think to be ſtark naught. But becauſe you call me ſo oft to Diſpute the main *Controverſie*, I tell you once, that it is diſingeniouſly done, ſtill in Print and Writing to call for more, as if we had never done any thing in it, while our Printed Books lie by you unanſwered. Anſwer my *Fifth Diſpute of Church Government*, 1. In the Point of *Prelacy*, 2. Of *Reordination*, 3. Of *Impoſitions*; and then call out for more when you have done: Or if you have more time, Anſwer *Gerſom. Bucer, de Gubernat. Eccleſ.* Baine's, *Dioceſanes* Tryal, *Robert Parker de Polit. Eccleſ. & Blondel de Epiſcopis*, where Dr. *Hammond* left at the entrance. One quarter of the Reaſons of our *Non-conformity*, is contained in theſe Books; and ſome are in *Ames* his *freſh Suit*, and *Nicols* and *Bradſhaw*; but the moſt are upon a new account, which our Fathers were not put upon.

2. I am

2. I am ashamed to Read a Preacher, a Writer, an Accuser of the afflicted, to talk of the dreadfull subject of *Oaths* so poorly as you do. Though I tell you, I will not dispute this Point with you without a License from Authority, I will say, 1. That when you say [*Take an unlawfull Oath in what sense you please, and will there be much need of absolution.*] You should not so confusedly have Named an *Unlawfull Oath*. Remember that you have proved against me, that a *Question may be false*. And that an Indefinite *in re necessariâ*, or thus unlimitedly delivered, goeth for an Universal: an Oath is *unlawfull*, 1. *Quoad actum imponendi*, 2. *Quoad actum jurandi*, 3. *Quoad materiam juratam*. If the *Materia Jurata* be Lawfull, do you think that the unlawfulness of the other two, do leave no need of an Absolution? 1. What if a Thief force me to swear Allegiance to the King, or to swear to do some Duty, doth it not add a Second bond? Or what if I vowed without the Command of any power? 2. What if I sinned in making a Vow, or Oath, by taking it from a Usurper, or without just Cause, or unreasonably, or to an ill end, *&c.* If the Matter be good, doth it not then bind me. And *de materiâ*, what if one *Article* or *many* be bad and another good, doth the Neighbourhood of the bad, disoblige me from the good. If so, it is but inserting some bad Clauses, and men may be bound by no *Oaths* or *Vows*, as in the former Case. It is but swearing sinfully, to an ill end, *&c.* and never be obliged. But if this be your Divinity about *Oaths* and *Perjury*, you have no cause to censure them so deeply that swear not as *quick* and *deep* as you. Your next *Question* is, *Must the sense of*

an

n Oath be measured by him that receiveth it, or rom the Authority and Intention of those that im-ose it. Answer, Still worse and worse: what confusion is here? Who knoweth whether by *easuring the sense*, you mean as to *the taking of the ath*, or as to the *Obligation of it when taken.* Your *Must* seemeth to speak of both. But 1. He hat *taketh an Oath* from one in lawful *Authority*, r from an *Equal*, is bound to take it in the sense f the *Imposer* or *Requirer*, whom we would sa-isfie. 2. He that taketh an Oath from a Thief r Murtherer, some *Casuists* say, (Is bound not o lie to hide his sense, but) may take it in a *sense ifferent from the Imposers*, *when the plain words ill bear it without a Lie.* As if a *Thief* or *Tray-r* should force the *King* to swear that he will do his or that, which hath an equivocal Name; If he *Traytor*'s sense be not according to the Com-oner use, or *defamiosiore analegato*, but the *ing*'s, they think that the *King* is not bound to wear in his sense, though yet he may be bound o *swear*, to save his life. 3. But our Case is only *De obligatione juramenti præstandi*: If a man that as bound to take the Oath in a *Usurpers sense*, hall either mistake the *Usurpers sense*, or shall *ke it in another sense*, as supposing that he is not ound to the *Usurpers*; I say, that this man if e make this *AVOW* to God, and not only an Oath to Man, is bound to keep it in the *sense he ok it in*, if it were *materially lawful*. If I Vow to ve so much to a Minister of Christ, and he that ceed me to it meant a *Mass-Priest*, and I mistook im, and meant a true Minister; I am bound by y Vow to give it him. If your *confused Question*

suppose

suppose the *contrary*, then a man's Vows to God are all *null*, if he that forced him to it were of another sense. A meer Oath to confirm a *Contract* to a man, is to be interpreted by the *Contract*: being but an *Obligation* to perform it; yea, and may be remitted by the man that will remit his Right. But in a *Vow*, God and Man are the *Parties*; and God's *sense imposing*, and *Man's sense intending* in the *Vow*, are each obliging: So that if ten men use the same words in *Vowing*, in ten several *senses*, they are ten several *Vows*, and all oblige if *materially lawful*. And therefore when you say, that the *Vow was commanded by Superiors*, and when I *know not the sense of one that vowed*, let him that will say of Millions, *that they are not bound*, no not when they vow against *Schism*, and *Prophaneness*. But you cite here a *Non conformist* against me, *Amesius Case Consc.* to *you*, *p.* 216. to *me p.* 203. But 1. He speaketh not at all of our Questions, *In what sense an Oath bindeth when taken*, but only in what sense *it ought* to be taken. 2. He speaketh not of a *Vow*, but of a *meer Oath*. 3. He speaketh only of the *Case of Equivocation*: but he that sweareth *in sensu famosiore*, to a *Thief* whose mind he is not bound to follow, doth not equivocate. 4. He himself saith in the next Case that the words of an Oath must be taken, *Et sensu quem audientes concepturos judicamus, id est regulariter eo sensu quem habent in Communi hominum usu*. But the *Audientes* and the *Imposers* may be different; and a man may think sometimes that the *Imposers* sense may be contrary to the *usum communem*, and his own agreeable to it. But this *impertinent Question* is nothing to us: Suppose that

that the *Powers* were bound to take it in the *Imposers sense*, but did not; the *Question* is, whether it bind them not in their *own sense*: (And in some possible Cases in *both*, and to *both*.)

You add [*You mention some good things in the Covenant; as the Declaration against Popery, Schism, and Prophaneness: But you pass by the second Article*, &c. *Ans.* So I perceive you would have me *Conform* that I may *Preach*: And what should I Preach against but *Sin*? And will you not give me leave to suppose, that *Perjury* is one of the greatest of all *sins*; and that he that is knowingly for *Perjury*, is against *humane society*, and not capable of *Trust* or *Credit*, and is against the *safety of the King*; which dependeth much on the *Conscience* of the *Oath of Allegiance* in his Subjects; and that he that would but say, *I would declare my self for Perjury, that I may preach against all other sins, is* ——. These things being premised, I ask you, *Are you in good sadness?* What! after such a *confident Perswasive to Conformity?* Will you tell your Hearers, *If you Vow to God Repentance, Obedience, or any Good; this Vow bindeth none of you all, if there were but some Evil joyned with it.*] And so, if a *Jesuit* would take the *Oath of Allegiance* or *Supremacy*, yea or the *Vow of Baptism* be taken at our *Christening*, if either Ignorance or Knavery do but joyn some bad things with it; nothing of all the rest is obligatory. What Cheater then will not foist in some *bad thing* into his *Vows*, that he may be disobliged from all the rest? If you dare preach such *Doctrine*, and dare die in the *Aprobation of it*, and dare perswade others to do the like, as their *Duty to God*; your *Book's Ti-*

tle

tle, shall make me view S. *Paul*'s warning, μή τις ὑμᾶς ἀβαλογίζηται ἐν πιθανολογίᾳ. Would you have me deliberately undertake to justifie all men from the *lawful* or *good* parts of a *Vow*, that I may have leave to preach against *sin*.

You add [*And the Power imposing the whole.*] *Answ.* Still all alike; What? will you tell your Hearers, that no *Oath* or *Vow* bindeth them, which powerless man imposed: The want of power in the *Imposers*, proveth indeed that no Power of theirs obliged you to take it. But what if you had taken it to save your life from a *Thief*, or within your Closet-walls voluntarily, without the command of any *Power*, doth it not oblige to *lawful matters?* Bishop *Sanderson* would have taught you otherwise to resolve *that Case*. This is a hard way to *Conformity*.

You add, [*What was good in it we were obliged to by a former Covenant.*] *Answ.* And what then? Is that another *Doctrine*, that *Conformists* must preach, That [*no Vow or Oath obligeth you to any good that you were obliged to before.*] Oh dreadful! The *Jesuits Morals* would abhor such a *Doctrine*: If there may be *new Vows* to the same thing, there may be *new* or *additional Obligations* to the same thing; else all the following *Vows* are no *Vows*. What if the *Oath* of *Allegiance* be thrice taken? Doth it oblige only the first time? Then if a man be at *Baptism* obliged to *Christianity*, no after *Vows* at the *Lords Supper*, or other time, are obligatory. Sir, be not angry with me for telling you, that *Non-conformists* have somewhat in them, that will not permit them to take these for *indifferent things*: And that the diminution of your

glory,

glory and mens *temptation* to *ſeparation* from you; hath too much occaſion and colour from your ſelves.

You add, [*The worſt of Hereticks maintain ſome Truths.*] *Anſw.* And *quid inde?* Suppoſe, ſo the *Covenant* hath ſome good? Our queſtion is not, whether we are bound to the *bad*, but to the *good*: And will you ſay, that I muſt receive no *truth* which a *Heretick* holdeth; or am bound by it to no *good*, which is contained in a *Vow* that hath *evil* with it.

§. 12, 13, 14. Will any thing convince you of an *Error* or *Sin*, if the viſibility of my words and yours, and my reminding you of your viſible miſreport will not do it? but ſtill when you ſee your words and mine, and hear of your *miſtake*; you will yet go on, yea and falſly add, that [*In one breath I ſay I did, and I did not retract them.*] This *practice*, and your fore-going *Doctrine* well agree: When I had askt you [*Whether it be all one to ſay I had expunged all that you accuſe me of (or charge me with) and that I expunged all that you pervert*] (or falſly took occaſion from for a viſible *ſlander.*) This is no ſtop to you, nor worthy of any *Anſwer*; but you go on: Yea when you tell me the *Page* you meant, and ſee that there is no ſuch thing there as you mentioned; yet all this (nor my many Writings againſt that ſame Opinion) are nothing at all to ſtop your *Calumny*. I am not juſtifying what I expunged; but if it were faulty, muſt it needs contain a *Doctrine* which it never mentioned, which I openly wrote againſt. This dealing is enough to tell me, to what purpoſe a *Diſputation* of *Conformity* with you would prove, when

when *Senſe* it ſelf will not convince you: And all your juſtification is, you [*give the ſenſe, though not the words.*] Utterly falſe; there are no words there (how bad ſoever) of any ſuch ſenſe. The words ſpeak moſtly *De fine belli*, and not of the *Juſtifying power*, which is ever ſuppoſed beſides a *good end*. I never thought that *War* might be made againſt *Authority*, for *Religion ſake*, what ever I might then think of the *Subjectum in quo* of that *Authority*, though not as *Hooker* did.

§. Still *Confuſion* and *Untruth* twiſted: I deny not that I led many (if you will call Convincing Reaſon, *Leading*) into an *Aſſociation*: was that in the Queſtiou before? I rejoyce and glory in it, and thank God for it, as much as almoſt any paſſage of my life! I told you before, (and two Printed *Agreements* told the World) what our *Aſſociations* were for. One was to exerciſe ſo much *Diſcipline*, as all the three Parties were agreed in, contradicting none of them in our *Agreement*. The other for *Catechiſing* and *Inſtructing* every *Family* at ſtated Days, every Week in courſe. And what's this to mens preſent coming to your *Churches* which you talk of. If they *Conform* no more than I, I am not aſhamed to be eſteemed a Promoter of their Judgment. If they *Conform* leſs than I, that they never had that from me, my *Five Diſputes of Church Government*, then written, are a viſible Witneſs againſt your *raſh* and *heedleſs Calumny*.

§. 16. Be not offended with me, for judging ſome *Conformiſts honeſt*: And I could wiſh that you would conſider of it, before you teach your People, that [*there are no honeſt Sinners.*] For that's

that's all one as to say, that the World hath never had one honest man, but *Christ*, and *Adam* and *Eve* a while. Though a man be not honest *quatenus vel in quantum* a sinner: (nor I think *quatenus* a *Conformist*) yet I hope still that there are some honest men in the World; yea such as have sinned *avowedly* and *deliberately* (when they knew it not to be *sin*, as most *Sects* that contradict each other do) yea and some that *sin against knowledge too* (as many do in their vain thoughts and words.) But where is it that I said, *that these honest Conformists sin avowedly, deliberately, and against knowledge?* Make Conscience of Truth. 'Tis like that I might sometime say, *What it would be in me if I should do it:* But is that to say, *that it is so in others*, whose *knowledge* I am a stranger to; or that it *borders on the sin against the Holy Ghost*. As for your *Invective* against these *honest Conformists*; I ask you, 1. May not a man be an *honest Conformist*, that taketh *Conformity* for a thing *lawful meerly* in case of Deprivation, as Mr. *Sprint* did, though he had rather be excused? If not, few learned godly Divines of my youthful acquaintance were honest men: For all such as pleaded then with me for it, went upon those terms. May not those be *honest Conformists* that heartily and openly wish for abatements, as the Bishop of *Chester* doth, and Bishop *Gawden* openly upon my demand of his Judgment, oft did. May not those be *honest Conformists* who go on Bishop *Reynolds* and Dr. *Stillingfleet*'s grounds, That *no form of Church-Government is of Divine Institution:* Or those that had rather all the *Ceremonies* were out of the *Church*, than so many *Preachers*. If they are, you do ill

to *censure* them as *dishoneſt*; If they are not, I ſhall never be induced to *Conform*: for it would be to give away my *honeſty*, if I do it on thoſe aforeſaid *Principles*. Thus I perceive that it is not *Conformity* that would ſatisfie you if we yielded to it, unleſs we alſo did it on your *Principles*. But if neither the *Biſhops* and *Clergy* of *England* in *Abbot*'s days were any of them honeſt, ſaving the few deſcribed by *Heylin* that went higher; or if all the *Latitudinarians* (that had rather the *Ceremonies* were forborn) and all the *unwilling Conformiſts* in *England* (that would not do it but to keep their *Miniſtry*) be *dishoneſt men*, I am not yet ready to fall in with that other ſort of men that charge ſo many of their own Society with diſhoneſty, and that account ſo *few honeſt*, who are accounted *honeſt* by the reſt of Mankind, and appropriate *honeſty* to thoſe, that others can hardlieſt diſcern it in.

§. 17. And will you ſo groſly diſpute down *Non-conformity*? To diſtinguiſh between [*meddling with the War*] *and entring into the Army*] to you is [*a Fly, ad populum phaleræ ſiculnea evaſa*, a little poor *Criticiſm*.] So that it ſeems you dare affirm or deny that of the one, which you do of the other. Durſt you ſwear that none of the *Lords*, or *Commons*, or *Citizens* meddled with the *War*, but thoſe that entred into the *Army*? And can you inſiſt on ſuch paſſages thus againſt your *light*, when your *Error* is detected? I pray you if ever you be a *Confeſſor*, reſolve not other mens Caſes of *Conſcience* at this rate, as you do your own.

§. 18. It is an unhappineſs in you, that ſo hard-

ly write that which is not *errour*, and yet ſo hardly acknowledge any *errour* in your *Writing*. The *Aphoriſms* recited by the *Biſhop* were mentioned by way of Accuſation: You excepted none, but ſpake generally of thoſe collected by him; What can I do more for *tryal* than to name *Particulars*? And where ſhould I begin but with the firſt? But it's many more that I can name, which would extort from you the ſame *Anſwer*: Particularly that which *Bagſhaw* (ſeeing there) was tempted to *tranſcribe* among his falſhoods, as if I had ſaid all that of *Oliver*, which I ſaid of his Son, which others alſo have falſly ſaid of me.

§. 19. It is a troubleſom thing to diſpute on terms not explained or underſtood: I thought all this while that *Presbyterian* and *Epiſcopal* had been terms whoſe *ſenſe* we had agreed of, but I was miſtaken; for now you let me know, that an *Archbiſhop* (who ſtrove hard for ſuch Preferment) who drew the reſt of the *Biſhops* into that high *Proteſtation*, for which ſome were impriſoned, who forſook the *Parliament* and went to the *Kings Party*; as ſoon as he ſaw that they would bring low the *Biſhops*, who for ſelf-ſafety turned to the *Parliament*, when he ſaw all was almoſt gone on the other ſide; and this but in *Wales* to recover his own Houſe: this man with you was a *Preſbyterian Archbiſhop*; I may underſtand ſhortly what a *Presbyterian* ſignifieth of late in *England*! As many *Epiſcopal Non-conformiſts* are ſilenced, and go now under the Name of *Presbyterians*: So take heed of *ſtraining* the word too high, leſt *Archbiſhops* and *Biſhops* at laſt be put down as *Preſbyterians* too. If he be a *Presbyterin* who is an

Archbiſhop, and would continue an *Archbiſhop*, becauſe he foreſaw that the *Biſhops* would pull down themſelves, and the *Puritans* would prevail. In this ſenſe I ſhould not have denied but that they were *Presbyterians* that firſt raiſed that War in *England* againſt the *King*: But your proof is out of *Ruſhworth*, p. 224. *viz.* No other than thoſe two famous men, Sir *John Lamb*, and Dr. *Sibthorpe* importuned the *Biſhop* to proſecute the *Puritans*; the *Biſhop* ſaid, *He knew of none, and asked what manner of people they be?* It's anſwered by Sir *John Lamb* in Dr. *Sibthorp*'s preſence, *That they ſeem to the World to be ſuch as would not Swear, Whore, nor Drink, but yet would Lye, Cheat, and Deceive. That they would frequently hear two Sermons a day, and repeat the ſame too, and afterwards Pray, and ſometimes faſt all day long. Then the Biſhop asked, Whether thoſe places where thoſe Puritans were, did lend Money freely (to the* King) *upon the Loan.* To which Sir *John Lamb* and Dr. *Sybthorp* replyed, *That they did generally reſolve to lend freely.* Then ſaid the Biſhop *No man of diſcretion can ſay, that that place is a place of* Puritans: *For my part I am not ſatisfied to give way to Proceedings againſt them.* At which Dr. *Sibthorp* ſaid, *He was troubled to ſee that the* Church *was no better regarded.* Very good; A *Presbyterian* then is a *Biſhop that is not ſatisfied to perſecute ſuch Puritans as thoſe.* Add but what is ſaid by many old *Conformiſts*, how the word *Puritan* was uſed with the utmoſt Malice by *Papiſts* and *Drunkards*, and *ungodly perſons*, againſt thoſe who were firm *Proteſtants*, and would not Drink, and Whore as they did; as Dr. *Robert Abbot*, *Regius Profeſſor* in *Oxford*, and *Biſhop* of *Salisbury*,

Salisbury, and Bishop *Downam*, (one that I verily thought had been no *Presbyterian*) in his *Spittle Sermon*, called *Abraham's Tryal*, Mr. *Rob. Bolton* frequently, (who thinks *there was never poor persecuted word used with such bitter malice by the mouth of the Serpents Seed*, as that word *Puritan* was at that day of good people.) I say take in all this, and let Posterity judge of an *English Presbyterian* by it, that he is one that will not persecute and undo such *Puritans*: We had divers such Presbyterian Bishops, *Usher*, *Bedle*, *Downam*, *Davenant*, *Hall*, *&c.* And before them *Grindal*, *Abbots*, and the most of our Bishops for Queen *Elizabeth's* Reign. Again, I confess that it was some such Presbyterians as these that raised the Parliaments Army in *England*.

The two next *Sections* evincing your Errour and Calumny you pass by.

§. 22. Is of no further use to us; only about Dr. *Jo. Reignolds*, you are a most deceived and deceiving Historian. 1. You do not know, *&c.* But *you might have known that there is extant in Print his Letters to Sir* Francis Knowles *against Prelacy, for a meer Moderatorship or Presidency.* 2. You say, [*Did he not live and die in full Conformity with the Church of England.*] *Answ.* A known *falshood*, if a *Question* may be false: What matter of Fact shall ever come to Posterity by such hands without *falsification?* if *Cartwright* and *Reignolds*, the leading *Non-conformists* of *England* were *Conformists*; Sir, I, and hundreds more have offered long to Conform as far to the utmost, as either of these did. And yet we are unworthy to Preach the the Gospel of Christ for want of Conformity; (It

may be, lest it prove them to be *Presbyterians* that will not prosecute us:) Learn better whether ever Dr. *Reignolds* did subscribe to the *Liturgy* and *Ceremonies*; whether ever he took the *Oath of Canonical Obedience*, or was not against the present *Prelacy*? Whether he was for the *Cross* in *Baptism*, &c. But you verily think that were he now *alive*, *he would be as hard a Mawl of the Schismaticks*, *and Non-conformists*, &c. *Answ.* 1. Of the *Schismaticks* no doubt, for he wrote against both *Prelacy* and *Separation*. 2. Wonderful! What cannot you verily *believe*, which you are but willing should be *true?* That an *Archbishop* is a *Presbyterian*, and that the *Leading Non-conformist* would be a *Mawl* of the *Non-conformists:* when 1. Twice as much is now required of *Conformists* as was then. 2. And Dr. *Reignolds* was not a man to do what he did without such Reason as would have made him constant. And to requite you with as strong Confidence, Sir, I do not rashly but soberly and deliberately profess, that were they *all alive* at this day (the old Religious Conformable Divines themselves) such as Dr. *Jo. White*, Dr. *Willet*, Dr. *Challoner*, Dr. *Field*, Mr. *Whateley*, Mr. *Crooks*, Mr. *Robert Bolton*, Dr. *Preston*, Dr. *Sibbes*, Dr. *Stoughton*, Dr. *Taylor*, with a thousand more, and a thousand; yea these that wrote for the old Conformity, Mr. *Sprint*, Mr. *Paybody*, Dr. *Jo. Burges*, *Forbes:* yea the old *Bishops* themselves, *Jewell*, *Sands*, *Grindall*, *Abbot*, *Miles Smith*, &c. I do firmly believe without hesitation, that the generality of them would have been *resolved Non-conformists* at this time, not changing their judgment, but because of the great

great Change of Conformity: For I know that *Cornelius Burges*, the Learned *Gataker*, Dr. *Robert Harris*, and almost all the late *Westminster Assembly*, were formerly such kind of Conformists as these were: And I know the same Non-conformists now (though not many) would have yielded to the old Conformity. Yea more, I am perswaded that were *Rogers*, *Bradford*, *Sanders*, *&c.* Yea Bishop *Hooper*, Bishop *Farrar*, and Bishop *Latimer* alive now, they would all choose rather to burn at a Stake again, than to do what is required of us. Say not that I reproach the *Laws*, for I only speak of the matter *of Fact*; whether they or the present Bishops were the wiser, I meddle not. Yea more, yet I much doubt, whether all the Bishops of *England* now would Conform themselves as Ministers do, if they were put to it? For I suppose you to know, that they are not put to the *Declarations* and *Subscriptions*, as the Ministers were, nor to their *Oaths:* But in this I am not confident, but only doubt. But of such old Conformists as *Bolton*, *Whateley*, *&c.* I make no doubt at all. 3. But your Proof is, *That he received Absolution according to the Church of* England. *Answer*, Is this proving? So would I do: yea, I do receive the *Lords Supper* according to the *Liturgie*. Am I therefore a Conformist? Doth it follow that he would swear, subscribe, declare, use the *Image of the Cross* as a *symbole* of Christianity, *&c.*

§. 23. Your *intimated Calumny* about Popery, it's well you let fall, though you confess it not.

§. 24. We come now to the greatest of our *Differences*, which you call my Πρῶτον ψεῦδος, about

a notorious matter *of Fact*, *Whether they were Presbyterians* or *Episcopal* and *Erastians*, that *first raised the Armies in England against the King:* When in the very Age that it was done, such a thing can be so confluently denied, what Credit is there in some mens *History?*

I thought all these set together, had been proof enough. 1. That former *Episcopal Parliaments* began the Business, and left it where these found it. 2. *Heylin* himself sheweth fully, that the difference was long working between the two sorts of *Episcopal men*, about *Arminianism*, favouring *Papists*, *Innovations*, and *Propriety*. 3. That such as *Jewel*, *Bilson*, and *Hooker*, gives us the *Principles* on which they did proceed: And Sir *Edward Sands* that hath written for *high Conformity*, and was *Hooker*'s Pupill and bosom Friend, was one of the Chief for the Peoples interest in these *Parliaments*. 4. That *Heylin* and *Rushworth* and *Fuller* acquaint us, That *Abbot* was laid by for refusing to license *Sibthorp*'s Book; and how the rest did prosecute *Mainwaring*. 5. That we knew our selves abundance of the Parliament-men, who were all of their Judgment; Viz. [*That Moderate Episcopacy was the best Government, and that the Bishops that followed* Lawd *did by Innovation seek to destroy both Religion and the Subjects Liberty* (as they thought) *and that it was necessary to bring down the Bishop's Power in Temporals, and to get better men that would be confined more to Spiritual Government, and use it better: But that no Episcopacy was so necessary, as that the State should be hazarded to support it.*] This was the Judgment of almost all them that I could hear or know of.

6. That

6. That even to this day 1671. there are yet about threescore of them alive, besides Lords, from whom the matter may be known. 7. That understanding conscionable Members of the House yet living, openly profess that *Presbytery* was scarce known among them, and that there was but one known *Presbyterian* then in that House. which was Mr. *Tate* of *Northamptonshire*, an honest man. 8. That when they had raised their Army, in their Propositions sent to the *King* at *Nottingham*, they offer the moderating of *Episcopacy*, and not *Presbytery*. 9 That the Earl of *Essex* General, the Earl of *Bedford* General of the Horse, the Earl of *Peterborough*, Sir *John Merick*, *Dolbiere*, the Earl of *Stamford*, the Earl of *Huntington*, the (now) Earl of *Denbigh*, the Lord *S. John*, the Lord *Roberts*, the Lord *Mandevile* (late Earl of *Manchester*) the (now) Lord *Hollis*, Colonel *Essex*, Col. *Goodwins*, Colonel *Grantham*, Sir *Henry Cholmley*; and so through the rest of the Colonels, were no *Presbyterians*; (though the Lord *Say*, Lord *Brook*, and the Lord *Wharton* were not *Episcopal*.) 10. That except these three last named, all the Parliament's Lord-Lieutenants through *England* that ever I could hear of, were men accounted *Episcopal* and *Conformable*; and these three were not accounted *Presbyterians*, but honest godly *Independents* or neither 11. That their Major Generals in the several Parts of the Land were commonly Episcopal and Conformable men; yea the Earl of *Stamford*, Sir *William Waller*, Mr. *G. Brown*, Mr. *G. Massey*, Mr. *Lawthorn*, *Ferdinando* Lord *Fairfax*, Mr. *G. Pointz*, Mr. *G. Morgan*, Sir *Thomas Mid-*

Middleton, Mr. *G. Mitton*, Sir *John Gell*, *&c.* 12. That the *Synod* at *Weſtminſter* at firſt were all *Conformiſts*, except about nine or ten, (As Doctor *Hammond* telleth them in his *Anſwer to the London Miniſters.*) 13. That the *Scots* themſelves (as may be ſeen in a late *Anſwer to the Biſhop of* Dumblanes *Accommodation*) do profeſs, That as *England* never was *Presbyterian*, ſo they never ſuppoſed that they ſhould immediately be ſuch, but only put into the *Covenant* the general words of [*Reforming according to the word of God, and the Example of the beſt Reformed Churches*] That they might engage them further to enquire what is the *Reformation* which is moſt agreeable hereunto; that ſo in time they might attain it: So that when the ſaid Biſhop (now Archbiſhop of *Glaſgoe* (being known to me) citeth my own words, and other mens, to prove that the *Aſſembly* or *Parliament* never intended the Renunciation of *Epiſcopacy*, but of the *Engliſh exorbitant Prelacy*, the *Scots Presbyterians* deny it not, but anſwer as aforeſaid. 14. That it is a commonly known thing, that the Covenant came in, not only after the Wars were begun, but when the Parliament was brought ſo low as to ſeek to the *Scots* for aid. And that *Presbytery* was little known in *England*, till the *Scots* brought in the knowledge of it. 15. And it was a notorious thing that the Parliament yielded to *Presbytery* and to exclude *Epiſcopacy* at laſt, not becauſe they thought that a *moderate Epiſcopacy* was not lawful and beſt, but becauſe they had no way to hold up their Wars, (without which they thought they had no way to uphold themſelves) but by the help of the

Scots

Scots and such as were against *Episcopacy*. And because they had seen the *Prelacy* fly so high, and now to be so strong against them that they had no hope of moderating it, but fear'd it would bear down all. Insomuch that Mr. *Thomas Coleman* gave the *Covenant* to the *Lords* with this open profession, That it signified not the Renunciation of *Episcopacy*. 16. And it is a notorious thing, that before the Parliament 1640, there were not so many Non-conformable Ministers in *England*, (Presbyterians, Independents, and Anabaptists altogether) as there were Counties in the Kingdom. And 17. It is known that few of those few had any hand in raising or promoting the War: Mr. *Dod* in *Northamptonshire*, Mr. *Ball* in *Staffordshire*, Mr. *Langley* in *Cheshire*, poor Mr. *Barnes* of *Uppington*, in *Shropshire*, Mr. *Oliver Thomas*, and Mr. *Wrath* in *Wales* (that quickly died, as almost all the rest did) Mr. *Augier* in *Lancashire*, Mr. *Slater*, Mr. *Root*, and a few more in all *England*. And 18. It is known, that when necessity had drawn them to please the *Scots*, and take the Covenant, the Parliament would never be drawn (though they made Ordinances for it) to appoint any to settle *Presbytery* in the Counties in execution of their Ordinances. But purposely delayed, and never did it, except in *London*, *Lancashire*, *Warwickshire*, and a few more places. 19. And it is known, that the Ministers of *England* themselves were but few of them indeed *Presbyterians*, and therefore were the backwarder to set up that *Discipline*: And therefore our *Worcestershire* Agreement (to concur in all that the three Parties are agreed in) did the more easily

and

and generally take; and that the People themselves were so generally against *Presbytery* (except some of the stricter sort) that they never would submit to it: And so *de facto*, it was never indeed set up, save in the few places forenamed. 20. Lastly, It is visible, that the Reasons of the Parliament's War published in their *Remonstrances* and *Declarations*, do suppose their Consent to *Episcopacy*, and mention nothing of a *change*: And that the *Lawyers* of the *House* (as Judge *Brown*, *Seldon*, *Glin*, &c.) were generally Episcopal *Erastians*, that thought *Episcopacy* lawful, as being from the *Soveraign Power*, which they thought might appoint *Church Government* as he please: (As Dr. *Stillingfleet's Irenic.* pleads; and as the *Kings late Acts* in *Scotland* intimate so far, as to determine that all the *external Government belongs to the King*: And I will not believe, though you should swear it, that the *King* is a *Presbyterian*. I did think that these *Twenty Evidences* set together, would have proved to any *sober man*, that on both sides it was *Episcopal men*, and *Episcopal Erastians* that raised the first War in *England*.

But all this *Evidence* notwithstanding, this is *to you the strangest Paradox in Historical Transactions that ever saw the light*: A *serious Confutation of it would have shewed you to be in a delirium*, &c. Answ. You have hit on the best *Confutation* of it in those words that the Cause was capable of: For now ignorant strangers and Posterity may possibly think, that a man would not so confidently deny a notorious thing, without some ground. But what are those grounds (for it is almost all one, as to dispute whether the *English War* was between *Protestants*,

teſtants, or between *Engliſh-men.)* Why 1. you ſay, That [*the Spirit of Presbytery and Non-conformity was ſtirring in thoſe Parliaments, though not known by thoſe Names.*] Anſw. Nay, then there is no dealing with you in *Hiſtory*. We judge of mens *Hearts* by their *Profeſſions* and *direct practice*, and take him for *conformable*, that ſaith *he is ſo*, and actually *conformeth*. But you ſee *deeper* into *the Spirit*: So you may ſay that it was the *Spirit* of *Socinianiſm* that workt in the *Arminians*, as others ſay, it was the *Spirit of Popery* that workt in *A.* Biſhop *Laud* and his Party; and others ſay, that it is the *Spirit of Democracy* that worketh in *popular Princes*, and the *Spirit of Rebellion* that workt in *Hooker*, and the *Spirit of Independency* that worketh in the *Preſbyterians*, and the *Spirit of Anabaptiſm* that worketh in the *Independents*; and ſo *Bagſhaw* and his Brethren ſay, it is the *Spirit of Conformity* that worketh in us. And ſo whatever *Errour* a man runs not as far from, as frightned, or furious Adverſaries do, he muſt be ſaid to have the *Spirit of that Errour*. As if a *Pythagorean* ſhould tell you that you have the *Spirit* of *Ajax*, *Thraſo*, or of ſome Brute. Sir, we plain people have hitherto taken a *Presbyterian* to be one that holdeth [*That the Church is and ought to be governed by Seſſions, Claſſes, and Synods, the leſſer ſubordinate to the greater, to which there lieth an Appeal, and theſe compoſed of Paſtors in parity and ruling Elders conjunct, and that not for meer Concord, but direct Regiment.*] Theſe are *Presbyterians* in the ſenſe of *Beza* and *Saravia*, *Downam*, and *Gerſ. Bucer*, *Bilſon*, *Hooker*, and all that have written on it: Whom though I differ from, I take to be commonly the moſt ſo-

ber,

ber, religious, strict, and *understanding sort of Christians,* (together with the *New England moderate Independents*) that I know, who make up a *party* in the world. And I take my self to be under a rational disparagement to differ from them so far as I do, though for *truths sake* I will bear that *disparagement.* But now *forsooth,* we have been professing *Episcopacy* and *Conformity* in *Parliaments,* that have the *Spirit* of *Presbytery:* And it was *Archiepiscopal* and *Episcopal Presbyterians* that began the *War.* Just as among the *Papists,* the poor *Jansenists,* yea the persecuting *Dominicans,* are said to have the *Spirit of the Calvinists,* Ergo, *they are Calvinists,* deny it who dare.

2. You prove it fully, by saying, *Did you never hear that when these Parliaments were in their full Cry against the* Duke *of* Buckingham; *they secretly moved him to make* Dr. Preston *Archbishop, and then all Complaints should be hushed?* Answ. What still untruths? 1. Produce your credible proof if you are able. 2. Could a *Parliament* which doth all things by the major Vote transact such a Business secretly. Could it have been proved, would not the Duke of *Buckingham* have alledged it against his Adversaries? 3. Would *Heylin* himself have silenced such a thing, and emplyed the contrary if it had been true.

4. Would Mr. *Thomas Ball* that Florid full *Historian,* in the Life of his Tutor Dr. *Preston,* have omitted it, when he advanced his Reputation as high in outward respects as possible.

5. But what if all this *had been true? Opertuit fuisse memorem?* Truth shameth the *cunningest* and most *confident Adversaries,* Doctor *Preston was conformable.*

formable. And is it a proof that the *Parliament* had the *Spirit of Presbytery*, if they would have had a *Conformiſt* made *Archbiſhop*. Thus we have ſtill your firſt deſcription of *Presbyterians*, viz. *Such Conformiſts as would be Archbiſhops, and ſuch Parliaments as would have Archbiſhops.* We call *Archbiſhops*, *Biſhops*, and ſo *Epiſcopal*; and you call them *Presbyterians:* And are we not there like to agree well of the *Thing*, that are not agreed of the *Name.*

6. But he that knoweth that *Abbot* was then *Archbiſhop* of *C.* will hardly believe you, that the *Parliament* would have had Dr. *Preſton* put in, (though it be nothing to the purpoſe.)

What you ſay of the *Infection* from *Geneva*, hath this ſenſe: [Geneva *infected the* Engliſh *Fugitives with Presbyterianiſm*; Ergo *the Parliament* 1642, *were Presbyterians.*] We deny the *Conſequence.* For, 1. They infected not all *England.* 2. Nor thoſe individual perſons. 3. They that were *infected* were *non-conformable Miniſters*, who were after *ſileuced* or trodden down by the *Biſhops*, and had not any *Votes* in Parliaments.

Next when I tell you, That *Parliament*, *Militia*, *Army*, Major Generals, *&c.* were no *Presbyterians:* You anſwer me, *That you meddle not with Lay-men.* Anſw. And what need we more, were not the Parliament *Lay-men?* And was it not the Parliament that raiſed the *Militia* and the *Armies*, and that gave Commiſſions to Major Generals *&c.* And was it not the *Lay-men* that were the Commanders and Souldiers that fought againſt the *Armies* of the *King.* And yet all this was an Hiſtorical Paradox to you. But you ſay, *The diſ-*

ſenting

senting Brethren were most guilty in blowing the Trumpet. Answ. 1. Suppose that were true; all that you can say were but this, *That one Episcopal Party raised a War against the King, and the other Party, because some Non-conformists blew the Trumpet, or perswaded them.* But if Episcopal men are so unstable and simple to be drawn into such a War by a few *Non-conformists*, why do you not acknowledge it? But you question *whether there were then so few Presbyterians in* England, *because a thousand subscribed a Petition in King* James's *time.* Answ. This is to write *History* by conjecture against notorious *matter of fact.* I named you the men; I can name you those in the *Assembly of Divines*, Mr. *Nie*, Mr. *Goodwin*, Mr. *Simpson*, Mr. *Bridge*, Mr. *Boroughs*, Mr. *Philips*, Mr. *Greenhill*, and Mr. *Caryl* (after) all *Independents*, and Mr. *Ash* a *Presbyterian.* Name me many more *English Non-conformists* if you can: And name me as many more in the Land then I have named, if you can! But *a thousand subscribed the Petition. Bancroft*, and your other such *Conformists* tell you, that it was not so, and that most of them Conformed then or soon after: You can believe such men when it serveth your turn. The truth is, many Conformed, and the rest were dead and gone. Do you think there were many *Non-conformists* alive in 1642, who subscribed that *Petition* when King *James* came in. If Mr. *Dod* were, I suppose not many more. But did *they not increase and multiply?* Answ. Excellent *History!* Did not we live in the Country with them? Should we not have known them? Name them as I do. They were all consumed to the number that I mention, except some that went into

New

New England; And of these named, divers came back out of *Holland*. *Death* and *Conformity* had almost made an end of them, when they wonderfully revived from among your selves. Know you not, that this is the *grand hope* of your *present Generation* from *old Experience*, that *Non-conformity* will be but *res unius ætatis*. (But *Reason*, *Conscience*, *Scripture*, *Duty*, and *Sin* will for all that be still the same.)

As to your doubt, whether *England* infected not *Scotland*? *Heylin* in his Life of *Laud* will tell you plainly. They might at last encourage them, but it was not for *Presbytery*, but for that which they called *Propriety*, *Liberty*, and *Safety* from *Bopery*. These were the *frights* of the Episcopal great men of those times: But as for any Ministers to *infect Scotland hence* with *Presbytery*, when it *there* prevailed, and *here* were next to none at all, it is a ridiculous fancy. But now you pretend to speak sence, and tell me, *That one of the Propositions sent to the King after* Edge-Hill, *was to abolish Archbishops*, *Bishops*, *&c.* Ans. Unhappy still! 1. But how long since after *Edge-Hill* Fight? Was it not long after, at the *Treaty* of *Uxbridge* that you mean? And was that before the raising of the *Army*? 2. Was not the *Propositions* at *Nottingham* sent by the Earl of *Essex*, a little before the raising of the *Army*? A surer Proof against you that *then* they were not for *Presbytery*, but restrained *Episcopacy*. 3. Even at *Uxbridge Treaty*, many thought that another frame of *Moderate Episcopacy* would not be well set up, till the present Frame was taken down. 4. And even then they said nothing that I know of for *Presbytery*. 5. But the truth is, they saw

by that time, that they could not ſtand but by the help of thoſe that were againſt the *Biſhops*, the *Scots*, the *Independents*, and the *unwilling Conformiſts* that deſired a *Deliverance*. But this proveth not that the Parliament was *Presbyterians* then, much leſs that they were ſo before the *Wars*: But you that *meddle not with Lay-men*, remember that *Lay-men* ſent thoſe *Propoſitions*.

You next tell me of Alderman *Pennington*, and the *Apprentices*. Anſw. 1. Few of thoſe *Apprentices* knew what *Presbytery* was, but were exaſperated againſt *Epiſcopacy* for the ſake of the preſent *Biſhops*; as the common people be now within theſe nine years, thinking that it's *they* that ſilence their *Teachers*, and cauſe all our *Diviſions*. But alas little knew they what *Church-Government* to deſire. But moſt that were in judgment againſt *Epiſcopacy*, were *Independents* and *Separatiſts* then. And how inconſiderable a number in *London* were thoſe *Apprentices*. 2. And our *Queſtion* is not, what Party of *Lads*, or *Apprentices*, or *Women* did clamour againſt *Biſhops*,? But what Party it was that raiſed the *War?* Did theſe *Lads* give the Earl of *Eſſex* his *Commiſſion?* But you find none *that ſaid any thing againſt their Petition, but the Lord* Digby. *Anſw.* And hath not he *forſaken you* alſo? 1. Where did you ſeek to find it? Not in the *Parliament Journal* ſure, elſe you might have found more. 2. The truth is, the *Epiſcopal Parliament* themſelves perceiving what Party they muſt truſt to, oppoſed not thoſe *Petitions*, becauſe the *Petitioners* might ſerve their turns, and I doubt were too well contented with them. But

as
Pa
ſh
Ep
or
we
ſuc
is,
cro
Bu
Lo
the
tro
you
was
ſo
dou
mer
Kin
it ſ
fire
of i
elſe
was
rent
pery
othe
not
and
doo
Par
3. T
Epiſ
Wig

as

as no man muſt ſay, that the *King* had the *Spirit of Popery*, becauſe he was willing that the *Papiſts* ſhould help him: So no man can prove that the *Epiſcopal Parliament* had the Spirit of *Presbytery*, or were againſt *Epiſcopacy* it ſelf, becauſe they were willing to be helped by all ſorts, who on a ſudden were fallen out with *Biſhops*. The truth is, the *ſuſpending* and *ſilencing* of *Miniſters*, and the cropping the *Ears*, and ſtigmatizing *Prin* with *Burton* and *Baſtwick*, had ſuddenly raiſed in the *London* Apprentices and others, a great diſtate of the *Biſhops*, though they knew little of any *Controverſies* about *Church-Government* at all. When you ſay, that [*Epiſcopacy* (or *rather Biſhops Lands*) was the *Palladium*, *&c.*] 1. Epiſcopacy was not ſo till after the Army was raiſed: It was ſo, no doubt, in the private deſigns of ſome particular men, *Apprentices* and *Women*, in the City and Kingdom; that is, all that were againſt it deſired it ſhould fall: And many that were *Epiſcopal* deſired that it ſhould rather fall, than the Abuſes of it continue by ſuch men as they thought would elſe ruine *Church* and *State*, thinking that there was no other way to ſave them: (ſo far did different apprehenſions about *Propriety*, *Liberty*, *Popery*, and *Arminianiſm*, carry men from one another, who were all for *Epiſcopacy*.) But forget not 1. *That it is the major Vote of the Parliament*, and not a few ſecret deſigners within or without doors, that is the *Parliament*. 2. That it was the *Parliament* that raiſed the *Militia* and *Armies*. 3. That this *Parliament* was not at that time againſt *Epiſcopacy*; (Therefore your talk of the *Iſle* of *Wight* ſo long after, is liker a Jeſt than ſerious.

Besides that you seem ignorant of, the *Parliament* resolved to accept of the *Kings Concessions*, (as *Prins* long Printed Speech will shew you) and therefore immediately before they should have voted that closure were pulled out by *Cromwell*, (who had secret intelligence what they were going to do.) 2. And your oblivion caused you by your *Parenthesis* to contradict what you have hitherto said your self: For if it were *Bishops Lands rather than Bishops that they would have down*, it implyeth that they were not *Presbyterians*, nor against *Episcopacy*. Would you make an *English-man* of this age believe, that none of your own Church have an appetite to *Bishops Lands?* Try them, and they will confute you more effectually than I can. Do you think that of the Multitude that now drink and rant, and roar, and whore, and rob, there are none whose Consciences could be content that *Bishops* fell, that they might have their *Lands*? you will say perhaps, these are not truly for *Episcopacy*. Ridiculous! Must we write Histories out of mens *secret thoughts* and *hearts*, and call men only what they are *conscientiously* and in *sincerity?* Who knoweth another mans *sincerity* but God? Come into *London*, or go among these Gallants, and tell them that they are not *Sons of the Church* if you dare. Hearken whether they talk not more for *Bishops*, than for any other *Sect*? Whether they do not *curse* and *damn* the *Presbyterians* and *Fanaticks*, and their *Conventicles*, and deride their *Preaching* and *praying*, and say as bad of them as you can wish them? Though I know that too great abundance since our silencing are fallen off from you to *Infidelity* or *Atheism*, and

and to make a Jeſt of the *Sacred Scriptures*; and the *Papiſts* ſay, that very many thouſands are turned to them: yet I ſpeak of thoſe that ſtill call themſelves *Proteſtants of the Church of England.* Really if you will take none to be of your *Church* that would ſell the *Biſhops Lands*, or none that are not *conſcientiouſly* for you; I doubt your *Church* yet will prove *inviſible*, and as little as ſome of the houſed *Sects.* And if that will ſerve your turn, I pray deal equally, and let the *Sectaries* alſo have leave to ſay of any of their Party that killed the *King*, or were guilty of *Treaſon*, *he was not truly one of us.* The *War* was firſt called *Bellum Epiſcopale* by the *Parliament-men*, becauſe they thought or ſaid that *Laud* and his Adherents were the Cauſes of it, by ſeeking to reduce the *Scots* to their will, and to ſet up *Altars* and other *Innovations* in *England.* But not becauſe the *Parliament* at that time renounced *Epiſcopacy* it ſelf.

As to the particular Members of the *Armies*, I confeſs I did know them better than you; I ſpeak not of *Fairfax* or *Cromwell*'s Army, but of *Eſſex*'s: And its well that you have ſo much modeſty, as not to deny that they were *Epiſcopal* or no *Presbyterians.* But you venture to ſay of thoſe yet living, [*That they were ſo whilſt they aſſiſted in the ſupport of the late Cauſe, I have not ſo far renounced my Reaſon and Experience as to fall in with your account. And if we perſevere in this new Doctrine, we ſhall be as diſtant as the two Poles.*] Anſw. Now you are at your Strength, your Confidence, and Reſolution to believe (or ſay you believe) as you do, is all the life of your Cauſe. It is now taken for no diſhonour to the greateſt Lords, to ſay, that

they are for *Episcopacy*. There are yet living the Earl of *Bedford*, the Earl of *Denbeigh*, the Earl of *Stamford*, the Lord *Grey* of *Warke*, the Lord *Hollis*, the Lord *Astley*, the Lord *Roberts*, the Earl of *Anglesey* (though he be no Souldier) Major General *Morgan*, Mr. *G. Massey*, Sir *John Gell*, and many more. Enquire of themselves, or any that know them, whether they were ever *Presbyterians*, or against a moderate *Episcopacy*. Sir *William Waller* was most called a *Presbyterian* (in your sense) who died lately, and hath told me (being my very dear Friend) his own Judgment and the Parliament's, as I now tell it you. I have in the heat of the *Wars* heard Sir *Thomas Middleton*, Major General *Mitton*, and many others thus give their Judgment: Yea, these were for the *Liturgy* and full *Conformity*; and some of them for Dr. *Hammond*'s highest strain of *Episcopacy*. But its sufficient to your Cause, that though the men who are yet living, are the best Witnesses of their own minds, yet you are resolved not to believe either them or me. But let me remember you of one *wide-mouthed Witness* more, which will almost swallow up your credit: When *Cromwell* and his Army, and their secret Adherents in the Parliament, cast out the *eleven Members* of Parliament first, and Conquered the City, and pull'd down all the Committees, and disbanded all the other Forces of *England*, (*Massey*'s Army, and all the Garrison and County Forces:) Yea before that, when they layd by *Essex* and his old Officers and Army, and abundance of the Parliament-men that had Command in Garrisons, Armies, *&c.* by the *self-denying Vote* (as it

it was called.) All this was done upon Insinuations, that they were not men to be trusted, being even then at the heart for the most part *Episcopal*. And if yet you are incredulous, and as distant as the other Pole, I will now but intreat you to fetch one *Argument* from the *North*, to draw you from your *North-Pole* distance; and tell your self whether Major General *Monk* (and *Morgan*) and his Army which brought in the *King*, and set up the *Bishops* again, was *Episcopal* or *Presbyterian*? And yet their long abode in *Scotland* made that *Army* accounted to be more *Presbyterian* than any *Army* that was in *England*. But as *King Charles* saith in his Letter to Mr. *Henderson*, *No man can so hardly understand as he that would not know*. That the *War is so odious now as that neither side will own it*, is no wonder, when they have learned by so much Experience: I would it had been so from the beginning.

§. 28. I must allow you to ease your Fancy with the name of [*Singularities, strange Imaginations, the body of a dead man, &c.*] for want of better stuff. But its more strange to me, that the Contention between *Arminian* and *Calvinian*, *Prelats* and *Prelatists*, should be talked of as so incredible; when your *Goliah*, *Peter Heylin* hath made it so much of the *substance* of his *History* of the *Life* of A. B. *Laud*. In what you say more of *Williams*, you still confute *your self*: For what say you, but that *selfish carnal Motives* did make an A. B. fight against the *King*. But was he therefore no *Prelatist*, and yet an *Archprelate*; or was he therefore a *Presbyterian* A. B. I again advise you not to cast all out of your *Church* that are ruled by *selfishness*

and *worldly intereſt*, leaſt you leave ſo few as will take away the *glory of your Magnitude*, and leave the *Sectaries* to vie with you for the *majority*. And I will intreat you but to mark throughout the foreſaid *Hiſtory* of A. B. *Laud*, how groſly and uglily your foreſaid *Champion* deſcribeth *Laud* and the chief of his Party, as if Preferment and Riſing were there very *ſcope*, and the contriving and ſeeking it by all *Friends* and *means*, were their very *Trade* of *life* and *buſineſs* in this world: So that to a truly heavenly mortified *Chriſtian*, it muſt needs ſeem as loathſom a Character, as Chriſt giveth the *rich man*, *Luke* 16. 12. if not much more: For he writeth *Pride*, *Ambition*, *worldlineſs*, ſeeking to be *greateſt*; as it were the very *Inſcription* of the *Picture* which he draweth; (As his own Letters in the *Caball* ſay the ſame of *Williams.*) And will you make that to be a *mark* of *No-prelate*, which your *Champion* maketh their *notorious Character*. Read him *impartially*, and *judge*.

As for *Arrius*, I had no acquaintance with him, nor have I any buſineſs with him: But if all my foreſaid *twenty Evidences* fail me, and I cannot know what a *Parliament* was? what a *Synod* was? what an *Army* was? when I was acquainted familiarly with ſo many of them all? How ſhould I know whether or no that *Epiphanius* ſpake truly of the *ſecret heart* of *Arrius* who ſo openly, falſly, and furiouſly abuſed and perſecuted his Superiour *Coryſoſtom*. You ſhall believe what you *will*, and I will believe what I *can*. But few men have ventured to caſt ſuch a ſlur upon S. *Hierom* as you do, ſaying, *That* [Jerom *himſelf was not a jot the better for it, even for miſſing of a Biſhoprick:*] *Medina* himſelf

himself hath not done him so much *wrong*. What *Bishoprick* was it that he sought and missed of, and when? Though he joyned with *Chrysostom*'s Adversaries, I find not that he sought his Place or any other *Bishops*, though he sowrly over-top *Augustine* in confidence of *arguing*; I find not that he sought to be above him in place. It's well that you are not out of hope of Preferment your self, lest you should turn *Presbyterian*: for (pardon on my *smarting sharpness* of speech to you (as you account it) while I tell you that) I take you not for a better man than S. *Jerom*; and therefore think that want of Preferment would do more with you, than it did with him. But this is the ordinary judgment of Worldlings, who measure other men by themselves. When I am dead, and cannot answer for my self, I doubt not but the same will be said of me, though you were now forced to recede from that Censure. But above all Impudencies, I must magnifie theirs that charge this on the *Presbyterians* as such, whose denominating opinion lieth in resisting all *Honours*, *Preferments*, *Precedencies*, *great riches*, *&c.* in the *Ministry*, save what meer Worth or Age procureth; and yet they are said to be discontent because they cannot be *Bishops*, when their *Doctrine* is against them. The Dog that is busie about his Carrion, snarleth at every one that passeth by, as jealous that he would bereave him of his Feast.

§. 29. 31. When the *Question* is, As whether the *Parliament* of *England* be *English-men*, or *French-men?* I will take your return of [*round*, *square*, and *forked Atomes*] for a very moving *Answer*, considering the *Cause* and *Person*. But

when

when I alledge your perverſeſt Champion *Heylin* only *ad hominem*, I will not believe that your Allegation of his Lies againſt *Presbyterians* is any more *argumentum ad hominem* to us, than if you alledged the authority of *Manesſeh Ben Iſrael*, till you have proved, (for what cannot you do that you have a mind to do) that *Pet. Heylin* (as well as the Archbiſhop of *York*) was a *Presbyterian*. I thank you for your ſilence to §. 32.

§. 33. When our Queſtion was of the Cauſes of the late War, and we came to recite the Principles of the Leaders of the Prelatical party, what ſhould I do more than name the men and their Books. When the Biſhop ſilenced me, and forbid me to Preach in his Dioceſs, he commended for my Cure the reading of *Bilſon* and *Hooker*, and named no others. I now recited the words of *Bilſon* and *Hooker*, the firſt as aſſerting the Principles of the *Parliament*; the ſecond as going quite beyond them on the Principles of them that pull'd down the *Parliament*, I cited *page* and *words* at large. To all this I have nothing but that *you will cover your Fathers nakedneſs, and not own all that they ſay*: But doth not this yield that *this was their doctrine?* What need you diſown or cover it, if it were not ſo? Yet nothing will make ſome men confeſs. But ſtill Mr. *Hooker* you *admire*, and ſo did *Camden*, *Uſher*, *Morton*, *Hales*, *Gawden*, King *James*, King *Charles*.] I dare not joyn my ſelf to ſo great Names as one of his Admirers, leſt I ſeem too much to value my ſelf. I will come far behind them, ſuppoſing that a long tedious Diſcourſe in him hath as much ſubſtance, as one might put into a Syllogiſm of ſix Lines. I ſaid, but that [*it was*

their

theirs and such Prelatist's Principles that led me into what I did and wrote.] His *Principles* might do it, and *not he*, as they were managed by other men. But these are Niceties to men that heed not what they read or say. What is written *Line* 1. *p.* 24. §. 10. you seem to defend: and 1. you say [*What is this more, than some that writ for the Kings Cause in the late Wars professed?*] *Answ.* And will you defend or own all that then was confessed by them? Have you read the Kings *Answer* to the 19 *Propositions*? Do you know that the *Parliaments* Adherents drew up a *Catechism* out of that *Answer*, as pretending to justifie all their Cause by it? Know you not that in *Fountains* Letter answered by Dr. *Steward*; and in Sir *Francis Nethersole*'s Writings for the *King*, and many others, those things are supposed or asserted, which I would not counsel you now to assert. Your Instance is, [*That as to making of Laws, our Kings have not challenged a Power without Parliaments.*] *Answer*, God be thanked, but that's none of our Question: But what you will not *know*, you cannot *understand*. Seeing you seem to justifie *Hooker* here, who saith, *That Laws they are not, which publick Approbation hath not made so:* (Which I believe of those Countries where such publick Senates have part in the *Legislation.*) By this you must say, that in the *Turks* Dominions, or any the like, there are no *Laws*. But if you say, that the Original Grant of the *Legislative Power to one is equivalent to an Approbation of his Laws:* I maintain that *Hooker*'s Principle is false, [*That by the natural Law whereto God hath made all subject, the natural power of making Laws to command whole publick Societies*

cieties of men belongeth, so properly to the same entire Societies, that for any Prince or Potentate of what kind soever upon earth, to exercise the same himself, and not either by expres's Commission immediately and personally received from God, or else by Authority derived at first from their Consent, upon whose persons they impose Laws, it is no better than meer Tyranny. How hard a task then do you put Kings upon to excuse themselves from Tyranny, when ever such *Prelatists* will accuse them of it. For 1. I hope you will not put them to prove [*That they have their Power by an expres's Commission immediately and personally from God*] (as *Saul* and *David* had) Shall we obey none but those that fanatically can pretend to a Revelation, or *immediate personal Commission from Heaven.* And 2. prove if you can, that the People have Regal power to *use* or to *give*. I grant that originally their Consent may be necessary to the designation of the Person or Family that shall receive it from God: But it is God that giveth the power, though the people choose the Person or Family; no man giveth that which he hath not: The People have not legal or governing Power, *Ergo*, they cannot give it. The Wife chooseth her Husband, but Gods Institution giveth him his power. If that it be certain (as Doctor *Hammond* hath proved against *John Goodwin*) that the Peoples consent doth give no *power*, but onely let in the person that shall receive it from God, and not from them; how dare you thus conclude all Kings on earth to be but Tyrants, as *Hooker* plainly doth: For no King on Earth hath [*an immediate personal Commission from Heaven*]

And

And no *King* (that I know of) can receive power from the People that never had it to give: *Ergo*, you make all Kings to be no Kings but Tyrants; but falsly. Will you defend this because *Hooker* wrote it? Were not these the Levellers and Democratists Principles, higher than the old *Parliament* owned? Must a *Clergy* of such Principles put men upon *banishing* the *Non-conformists* five Miles from a *Corporation*, as men of seditious Principles. —— *Terras astraea reliquit.* You tell me, *I take what is for my purpose, and leave out the rest.* Anſ. *Semper idem.* Do I maim any Sentence? Do I pervert any? Is the rest contradictory to this? What in the great *Hooker?* No, not at all. I suppose the rest. Unrighteous man! If you require me to write out all his Book, when ever I transcribe a part? I own that which you transcribe? What would you have more. But next you say, that I have found *other Doctrine* in *Hookers* other Books. *Answ.* A silly pretence, of which anon. You ask [*Was you led aside by* Hooker, *&c. yet you quote passages out of the 8th Book, that came out since. Anſ.* A man that would turn us to *Conformity*, must be able himself to heed what he readeth; 1. I said, not that *Hooker*, but *such Principles* led me. 2. I never said, that I was led by every word that I now cite, but that these words contain the Principles which misled me (that is, so far and so long as I followed those Principles.) Do you not see that your heedlesness tempted you to this Error; and yet your [*Ex post liminio*] and [*first building the Roof*] seemed sence to you, or you would have them seem such at least to me.

But

But it's well that you disown these *three Books* of *Hookers* also. But 1. is not this forecited in the first, the very sum of all that you are afraid of? 2. Will you so give away the *sixth* and *seventh* which say far more for *Episcopacy* than all the rest? 3. Will you thus reproach all Bishop *Gauden's triumphant Vindication* and *Dedication* to the *King*? 4. Did he not tell you that the Copy was interlined with *Hookers* own hand, as approving it? What would you have more? 5. I again tell you, I can bring you proof of a *Concordant Copy*, (the *Scribes Errates* excepted). 6. Mr. *Walton* could not deny it. 7. Dr. *Bernard* cited by you confirmeth it. For to say, that a Sentence or two were left, doth intimate that the Book was his; and *leaving out*, is not *putting in*: And I cited nothing that was *left out*, nor any thing in it that is *maimed* for want of it. 8. Any man may see that the 8th Book was *imperfect*, and that is proved by the *matter*, *manner*, and *end*: But it was nevertheless *Hooker's*, and concordant in *style* and *matter* with the first. And have you now vindicated the *Doctrine* of the chief *Prelatists* any better than by disowning them? And do you take it as incredible, that many *Episcopal men* in *Parliament* should think as *Bilson* and *Hooker* thought, and as the great Speakers, Sir *Dudley Digs*, *Cook*, *Philips*, *Eliot*, and many such in former *Parliaments* did seem to think.

§. 35. Did you write against their *Discipline* with such ugly Insinuations of Treason, before you knew what their *Discipline* was, and then think you are excused by saying, *It must not be touched*. 2. Did you not know till now, that the

Non-

Nonconformiſts are not in all things of one mind? They never pretended to it: How many men are ſo, whoſe Faith is their own? Are you after ſo many years to learn, that ſome that Conform not are *Epiſcopal*, ſome *Presbyterians*, ſome *Independents*, and ſome as we of *Worceſterſhire* (and I think moſt of *England*) addicted to no Party; but thinking that each of the three (and the *Eraſtians* too) have ſomewhat in which they excel the reſt, and ſomewhat in which they erre more than the reſt. This is our judgment: And will not old printed Writings make you know it, before you firſt write againſt it, and then wonder at it, and make a ſtir about that which you know not, when i'ts told you. You next think that by *proving that they flie their Habitation, and refuſe the Oath, you ſufficiciently prove* ——— *that the Chorus ſticks at renouncing War againſt the King.* Becauſe it is a ſerious buſineſs; I muſt profeſs that you here ſo croſs the common Principles of Reaſon, Humanity, or Chriſtianity, that you do not at all tempt me to Conform: When you know (if you are reaſonable) that if they ſhould take *all the Oath* except the *laſt Clauſe*, they are nevertheleſs to be confined from Corporations? When you *know* (if you are reaſonable) that a man may judge the firſt part, or one part lawful, that thinketh otherwiſe of the *laſt*, and ſo that he muſt remove his Habitation! To conclude, yet that the *flying of their Habitations, and not taking the Oath is a proof that they are againſt the whole, or againſt that Clauſe that renounceth Arms againſt the King*; and to take this for a *Demonſtration*, as *going* is, that there is *motion*: I tell you again, this reaſoning beſeemeth not

not a Divine, or a man. Doth it not imply, th
you will take an Oath your self, if you judge b
one part of it lawful? And yet before, that *Va*
doth bind no man to the lawful parts which you sai
had in it *some parts unlawful*. Thus *Errors* agre
amongst themselves.

You open your self yet more; you say, [*Th*
makes me nauseate your Principles as much as the fo
mer, viz. Not *swearing*, not to *endeavour an altera*
tion in the Government of the Church.] *Answ.* An
indeed, do you loath as much the altering of yo
Church Government as the *Kings*, and yet be *loyal*!
Is it as loathsom to turn *Dioceſance* into the ol
Epiſcopacy, or to ſet up Biſhop *Uſher*'s Model
which we offered, yea or to take down *Lay Cha*
cellor's power of the *Keys*, as to take down *King*
Yet this tempts me not unto Conformity. Yet d
you not ſtick to ſay next [*Yes, by Petition, as be*
comes ſubjects (viz.) *we may endeavour alteration.*]
Anſw. What a ſaying and unſaying is this? And
what a jumble of ſwearing and unſwearing would
you have us make? Will men awake believe that
Petitioning is no *Endeavouring*? Will you preach
this Doctrine to your Flock? *You may lawfully*
ſwear that you will not any time endeavour an alter
tion of the Scripture, of the Miniſtry, of the Uni
verſities, of Religion, of Monarchy, and yet may
endeavour it by Petitioning, that Oath notwithſtand
ing.] May a man ſwear univerſally, and mean
particularly. May he ſwear that he will not at any
time murder his Child, and mean [except by
famiſhing him.] May he ſwear that he will never
endeavour to defame you, or take away your Life
or Lands, and yet may Petition the *King* or *Par-*
liament

liament to take them away? ſwear with you at theſe rates that will for me. But by this it appeareth that *quoad ſenſum* you are of the Nonconformiſts mind, though not as to the method of ſwearing: For if they could but ſtretch their Conſciences to put your ſenſe upon that Clauſe of the Oath, they would take it: And yet do you nauſeate their Principles and Diſcipline, becauſe they cannot interpret it as you, who would take it were it ſo interpreted? See then by how ſmall a matter (even the meer expoſition of the words.) *Satan* can tempt ſome men to nauſeate the Diſcipline and Principles of others that fear an Oath. But you think [*in our Places and Callings*] is, that *Miniſters muſt preach them down, and Souldiers fight them down. Anſ.* 1. But is not *Petitioning* confeſt by you to be agreeable to the *Place* and *Calling* of a *Subject*, and therefore allowable. And ſo you build up what you would pull down. 2. Either it belongeth to the *place and calling of a Miniſter to preach for Church Reformation in the ſaid Alteration, or not.* If it be, dare you oppoſe it? If it be not, this Clauſe reſtraineth it. 3. If the King (who can give Souldiers Authority) ſhould commiſſion Souldiers to pull down Lay Chancellors, or alter Prelacy, and make a Biſhop in every Market Town or Pariſh, would you teach the Souldiers to diſobey and any to reſiſt him? What! and yet in the Oath ſwear that it is not lawful to reſiſt any Commiſſioned by him? But a Souldier that is not authorized to do it, doth it not in his *place* and *calling*. Your talk of changing *Diſcipline* with *Rebellion* by *inſtances* from *practices*, is but a proceeding in bold Calumniation, when

you say nothing to the Vindications which Dr. *Pet. Moulin* Bishop *Bilson*, King *James*, and others have given it. And to name no Instance but that of *Prague*, is so bad, that I will not name its quality. Do you know what *Discipline* they were of at *Prague*? I suppose you know that the *Bohemian Waldenses* were Episcopal, as *Commenius* and *Lascitius* Treatises will shew you under the name of *Seniors* and *Conseniors*. And the *Palatine Discipline* was mostly *Erastian* by Magistrates, even long before *Erastus* pleaded for it against *Beza*, even as was and is the *Discipline* of the *Helvetians*. And hath the Image of both Churches, or some such Papist put this into your head, to nauseate Magistrates, Church-Government, for the sake of them of *Prague*, that raised a Tumult against the Magistrate (on what cause I leave to just Historians.) When you ask me what I think of those *disciplinarian Principles*. I answer, I think who ever used them they are false, and I think him a shameless Calumniator that will charge them on us that Conform not, without one syllable or shew of proof: Do you mean [*Bancroft* and *Heylin charge them on some called Disciplinarians in the last age.* Ergo, *I may charge them on the present Non-conformists; yea on the whole Chorus, yea on their Discipline that desired Bishop* Usher's *Episcopacy.*] Let it be so, that you may be your self: As to what you say against the *Genevian Principles*, as against Government, *&c.* I answer,

1. Why did you not name some one of those Principles, and try by what Consequence it inferreth all the *Villanies* which you name. Do not the *Papists* say the same of the *Protestants*. 2. And

next,

next, why did you not prove that we *hold thoſe rebellious Genevian Principles?* Were it Chriſtian dealing in me, if I ſhould ſay, [*Becauſe* Prins *Hiſtory of Prelates Treaſons proveth that multitudes of Prelates have been Traytors therefore our preſent Prelates are ſuch too.*] But we ſee what Inſtruments the Prince of Malice and Calumny uſeth. You tell me that you ſhall the leſs believe *Confeſſions*, becauſe the *Parliaments Declarations* ſo differed from their practice. *Anſ.* 1. But will you falſly accuſe the part that is good for the part that is evil? Moſt Chriſtians live not according to the Chriſtian Profeſſion: Is the Chriſtian Profeſſion therefore bad, and the cauſe of all their *Villanies?* Will you judge *fidem ex homine?* Will you charge all that upon a mans Religion objectively conſidered, which you find amiſs in his life. 2. Do you not know that our Queſtion now is not what the *men are*, but what their *Principles* and *Diſcipline*, and that it is not the *Profeſſio profitens*, but the *Profeſſio profeſſa* which is to be diſputed of. And by what means ſhall any Church or Party under Heaven defend their Religion againſt ſuch a Cenſurer and Diſputant as you are? They will ſay that they have the true Religion; you will ſay, no, for you are not true to your Religion: They will ſay, that their *Articles* are true; you will ſay, no, they are falſe, becauſe you live not according to them, (which implieth that they are true and good, or elſe what fault were it to contradict them in practice.) The *Proteſtant* will ſay, Our Religion is ſound and agreeable to Gods Word: you teach the *Papiſts* to anſwer, no, it's falſe, for there are vicious Livers among you. And I pray you,

what number of Sinners must go to prove a *Religion*, *Creed*, or *Articles* false? Must it be all, or the major part, or will any one serve? Must the *Kingdom* try by the *Pole*, or Vote whether the *Vicious* or the *Vertuous* are the greater number among them, before they can prove their Religion true? Doth the Act go to the *Essence* of the *Object*? 3. But if it must needs be so, I pray dispute no more against the *Non-conformists*, or dispute against them better by your *Lives*, than you have done? Will you teach them to argue the *XXXIX Articles*, the *Liturgy*, and Book of *Ordination* are not true, or to be subscribed, because the *Conformists* live thus or thus. You know Foreigners and Posterity know not which of the Histories of this Age are true or false: Suppose that they should read Mr. *White*'s *Centuries* of *Drunkards*, *&c.* ejected from the Ministry, and the Records of the *Country Committees*, saying, So many and so many were upon Oath proved scandalous Drunkards, *&c.* And *Ralph Wallis* naming so many Drunkards and scandalous *Conformists* now. Would you have them question the *Principles* and *Discipline* of the *Church of England*, till they can prove these Histories false. I profess to you resolvedly, that if I must needs judge that Church or Party to have the soundest *Principles* and *Discipline*, who have the best lives; I should far and very far prefer the *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and much more the *Conciliators*, before the *Prelatists*, and yet not extenuate any of their Faults. But all this is nothing to you that go another way to work. *[*Why tell you of mens Professions, when you see their contrary Practice?*]

ctice?] When as it is not the *Practice* only, but the *Profession* that is the *Principles* and *Discipline* that you accused: And so when their *Principles* are in *question*, why do we talk to you of their *Principles?* And how silly a shift is all this covered with? Because the *Parliament promised to make the King the most glorious King, if he would return to them, &c.* But 1. Is a *Promise* and *Disciplinarian Principles* of the same nature, when we question their *truth.* The *Promise* is not true, unless it agree with the *Mind of the Promiser*, of which God is the *Judge* till *Performance* shew it. But *Principles* may be true, though he that professs them be never so false. 2. And I pray remember, that the *Parliament* were pulled to pieces, and conquered by Souldiers (even for resolving to close with the *King*) before the *King* could be cut off. But as for the first War, I have told you the *Authors* of it.

To your next; [If we must call none *Episcopal men that are not faithful to their Principles*] Then I know not indeed whom I may call such: If Parties must be notified by their Fidelity, we should have agreed thus to sense the Word before we had disputed, for other men speak not thus. Did you think I cited *Moulin* against *Philanax* to prove that our Principles are better than the *Papists.* Have you read him all, and understand him no better? I cited him as fully proving historically that the Places now charged with *Presbyterianism* and Rebellion, *Geneva, Holland, &c.* had changed this *Government* before, or on other accounts; *Flanders* and *Brabant* joyned with *Holland* in the change, the main Body

being *Papists*, who after fell off when the Prince of *Orange* mentioned *Liberty of Religion*. And for *Geneva*, *pag.* 27. he saith, [*My business being to vindicate the Reformation from the charge of Rebellion, I must take from the Reformers of* Geneva *that Aspersion, that they expelled their Bishop, and that they altered the Constitution of that State, and both these ascribed to* Calvin: *It is a Tradition received in* England, *as a currant and undoubted Truth:* (A fair Credit to the Prelatists Honesty and historical Veracity!) *And upon that ground many fine and judicious Inferences are built. But it is like the Story of the Phœnix, and the singing of Swans, never the truer. What credit can be given to Histories of things hapned in the* Indies 2000 *years ago? if in things done so lately, and so near us, gross Mistakes go for uncontrolable Truths.* (You know with whom.) *I say, it is utterly false that* Calvin *was one of the Planters of the reformed Religion at* Geneva. *False also that he or the Reformers at* Geneva *turned their Bishop out of doors. And false also that the Bishop went away upon the quarrel of Religion. The Bishop was fled eight Months before the Reformation, seeing his Conspiracy discovered to oppress the Liberties of the City by the help of the Duke of* Savoy, *for which his secretary was hanged after he was gone; the said Bishop being hated before, for the Rape of a Virgin, and many Adulteries with Citizens Wives. And it is most to be noted, That they who after his flight reformed the Civil Government were strong* Papists, *and mainly opposed the reformation of Religion.*

I shall recite no more out of this Episcopal Doctor, Prebend of *Canterbury*, but desire you again

again to read *page* 23, 24. What changed *Luther*'s mind to own the Proteſtants Arms againſt the Emperour. And *page* 32, 33. What King *James* ſaith to vindicate the *French Proteſtants*; [*I never knew yet that the* French Proteſtants *took Arms againſt their King, &c.*] And that *Cap.* 3. *pag.* 64, to 73. He cites the Confeſſions of all the Churches, the *Auguſtane*, the *French*, the *Belgick*, the *Helvetian*, the *Bohemian*, the *Saxonian*, the *Swevian*, the *Engliſh*, as conſenting for Obedience to their Soveraigns. But all this is nothing to you that can ſay nothing of worth againſt it: Neither the Vindication of their *Principles* or *Practice*. But (*unrighteous Judge*) I am with you (*partial* and *unequal.*) 1. Becauſe I told you, that you ſhould not have ſet down the bare Names of *T.C.* and *Travers*, as a Charge, without citing what they ſay. And is not that true? Is that an unequal expectation? And what if I had added, That had you proved them guilty, it had not concerned any of us, or our *Diſcipline* or *Principles*, till you had proved that we had owned the ſame? And is that *unequal?* O *Juſtice!* 2. Becauſe I ſaid, [*I will no further believe* Bancroft *or Sir* Th. Aſton, *then they prove what they ſay.*] No, nor you neither. Muſt I believe Adverſaries accuſing Parties without proof, and *ſuch Adverſaries* too! Why muſt I believe them more than *Heylin*, or more than Doctor *Moulin* aforecited believed the *Engliſh Tradition* againſt *Geneva?* Is this the equality of your way?

§. 37. It's tedious diſputing with a man that cannot or will not underſtand what is ſaid, no not the *Queſtion*, no not the *Subject* of it. You

cite my words out of the *Saints Rest*, that say not any thing to the *Question*. The *Question* is not, *What were the final Motives of the War*? But, *what was the Controversie of the warranting Cause and Foundation*, that must decide the Case, whether it was *lawful* or *unlawful*. The *Bonum publicum*, and the *Gospel* and *Religion*, and *mens Salvations*, are the *great moving ends and Reasons of a lawful War*. But it is not these *Ends* that will serve to prove a *War* lawful? Could that be the *Cause* or *Controversie* which they were both agreed in? Did not the King profess to be for *Religion, Liberty, &c.* as well as they. See yet his *Shrewsbury* Half-crowns (if *Coin* be any evidence with you) private men may not raise War for *Religion*; but the *King* may. The *Finis* and the *Fundamentum* are not the same. I there talkt but of the *Finis* and *Motives*, I now speak of the *Fundamentum* and *Controversie*, which is well known to be, whether the *King* or *Parliament* then had the power of the *Militia*, *rebus sic stantibus*; and whether the *Parliament* had *true Authority* to raise an *Army* against the *Army* Commissioned by the *King* for that Defence, and executing the *Law* upon *Delinquents*, which they then pretended to. Now I say still, I know no Theological Controversie herein: I know no *Scripture* but *Policy* and *Law*, and *Contract*, that will tell us, whether the *King* of *Spain*, or the *States*, be the rightful Governours of the *Low-Countries*? Or, whether the *King* of *France* be absolute? If you can out of *Scripture* prove that all *Republicks* must have the same *Form* and *Degree* of Government, or how *Forms* and *Degrees* must be varied

in

in each Land. I reſiſt you not, but only confeſs my weakneſs, that ſo high a performance is beyond my power. Had you underſtood the *Queſtion*, you might have ſpared your Citation of my words.

§. 41. You come again to our *ſwearing Conformity*; and you ſay, [*That it muſt reaſonably be underſtood of a tumultuous and armed endeavour.*] *Anſw.* 1. And it is publickly known that we are ready to *ſwear* againſt a *tumultuous* and *armed endeavour* (unleſs by the *King*'s *Command.*) If you would not endeavour it, even with Arms, if the *King* commanded you, accuſe us not of *Diſloyalty* for being more *Loyal* than you. If you would, we are of the *ſame judgment* as to the *thing*: And ſo (while the thouſands of ignorant Souls are untaught) men of the ſame judgment (on our part openly profeſſed oft) muſt ſome be *Teachers*, and ſome *ſilenced*, ſome *preferred*, and ſome in *Priſon*, and *baniſhed* from Corporations, *&c.* even while they hold the ſame thing. And why? Becauſe one part of them dare take an Oath in a more *ſtretching ſence* than the others dare: And that, 1. Becauſe they are taught (not only by *Ameſius* where you cite him) but by all conſciencious judicious Caſuiſts, That an Oath is to be taken *ſtrictly* and not *ſtretchingly*, in the common ſenſe of the words, unleſs the *Lawgivers* will otherwiſe explain themſelves. 2. And the words are univerſal [*Not endeavour at any time*] without the leaſt limitation or exception of *any ſort of endeavour.* (I ſhould have broke that Oath by this writing to you had I taken it.) *Et non eſt diſtinguendum aut limitandum ſine lege.* 3. The *Law-makers* are to be ſuppoſed wiſe, conſiderate

siderate men, especially the *Bishops*, and able to distinguish between an *universal* and a *particular* or *limited enunciation*, and to express their minds in congruous words. 4. The *Law-makers* knew before and since that we would take the *Oath*, if (*Endeavouring*) had been limited as you do; and yet they never would limit it by one syllable. 5. The Reasons used for that Clause, and our acquaintance with the *Bishops* and other *Authors* of it, leave our Consciences perswaded, that *their meaning was* against *all Endeavours*, and not *tumultuous*, *military*, or *illegal* only; as in the *Et cætera Oath* 1640. It was that [*I will not consent*] which is less than [*Endeavouring.*] And we are not ignorant what relation this Oath hath to that: And we take it to be a sin to deceive our *Rulers*, by taking an *Oath* in that sence which we believe was not by them intended, and seeming to them to *swear* what we do not *mean*. 6. When twenty *London Ministers* took the *Oath*, because Doctor *Bates* told them, that the *Lord Keeper* promised him at the giving it, to put in the words [*Endeavour by any seditious or unlawful means*] (or to that sense) the said limiting words were not only left out, but when old Mr. *Sam. Clark* said, *My Lord, we mean only unlawful endeavour:* Judge *Keeling* asked, *Will you take the Oath as it is offered you*, and refused to add any such Explication; and told them when they had done, they had *renounced the Covenant*. 7. The Justices tell us when they offer us the *Oath*, That we must take it according to the plain sense of the words. 8. The *Parliament* in the *Act for regulating Corporations*, in the

Decla-

Declaration there impoſed, and the *Oath*, doth fully ſatisfie us what is their ſenſe about this matter. 9. It is not true (as far as any *London Miniſters* can know) that ever the Judges declared their ſenſe as you ſay for that limitation: That is, that ever they did by any Conſultation and Concord give any judgment in the Caſe, whatever any ſingle Judge (as the *Lord Keeper*) might ſay privately, or any one alone, when another may ſay the contrary. 10. If they had, it's a known thing, whatever their judgment may do to make Caſes in the Common Law, yet as to Statute Law, only the *Law-makers* are the *Law-Interpreters*, as to any Interpretation which ſhall be as the Law it ſelf, a Rule univerſally to the Subjects: And that Judges and Juſtices (who here are made the Judges) do only interpret the Law, for the deciſion of particular Controverſies that come before them. And if all the Judges and Juſtices in *England* ſhould meet and agree of this Statute, it would only ſhew how they reſolve in particular judgments to expound it, and not what is the true obliging ſenſe to the Subjects Conſcience: Otherwiſe the Judges would be equal to, if not above the *King* and *Parliament*. For he hath more power who determineth what *ſenſe* and *ſoul* the *Laws* ſhall have, than they that only make the *words* and *body*, which others may put what ſenſe they pleaſe on. Nor can all the Judges make it lawful to take up Arms againſt the *King*, if they ſo expounded any Law: They have a deciding *Expoſitors judgment* as to the Caſe before them, but not the *regulating univerſal expounding power* at all. 11. We think that

that *Divines* that preach against sin, above a men must not stretch their Consciences in so *dangerous a point* as *publick Swearing*. 12. And we think that if men be once taught to equivocate and play fast and loose with the sacred Bond of *Oaths*, Conscience is quite debauched, no sufficient Bar is left to keep out any the greatest sins: *Preachers* and *People* become incredible; humane Society is endeavoured to be dissolved, and the *King*'s Life (secured much by his Subjects Fidelity and Conscience of an *Oath*) is exposed to the wicked wills of men. We charge no other with all this, but we will avoid it our selves though it cost us yet more. You may swear [*not to endeavour*] and mean particularly [*not by Tumult or Arms, but by some other endeavour*]; but so cannot we. Therefore do you enjoy your *Liberty*, *Maintenance*, and *Honour*, and we will be without them; and to morrow, at death, we shall be as free and as high as you.

But fie, Sirs, why will you talk of [*straining Oaths, and turning plain Oaths into Snares, and allowing no Interpreters?*] Are your ways here *equal too*? 1. What is the plain sense, but an *universal sense* of an *universal enunciation*? If by [*All*] or [*None*] I understand *All* or *None*, and you understand not *All* but *Some*, who is the *Strainer* of the *Oath*? And I pray you tell me, if once *any endeavour* shall be excepted, who shall determine how much it must be. The first part of the *Oath* saith [*Not on any pretence whatever.*] That is, we must not take up Arms against any Commissioned by the King. What if a bold limited Expositor will here come in, and say,

[Ex-

Except King *John* deliver up the Kingdom to the *Pope*; Or except the King's Commissions through the Officers fault should be contradictory] Or such Exceptions as *Wil. Barclay* and *Grotius* make? Should not this man rather be the Equivocator and Strainer of the *Oath*, than he that thinketh so plain a Phrase, as [*not any pretence whatsoever*] is exclusive of any pretence whatsoever? Never trust the man that feareth not an Oath. 2. But why talk you of *none being Interpreters?* we cannot give the Power to whom we please: The Law-makers think it best as it is, and will not interpret as you do, when they can, and know all the Reasons that you can give them. The Justices are made our Judges: I told you that the Justices when they sent me to the Gaol, refused to Expound it, and told me I must take it according to the proper sense of the words. Yet do you go on, as if none of all this had been said to you.

As to what you say of *Obligation by the Covenant, and leaving a gap, &c.* I answer, Melancholy men by fearing bring the thing feared on themselves: It was the *Et cætera Oath* 1640, that forced me (who else had lived quietly in my ignorance) to read and study many *Authors*, to know the truth before I swore, who turned me (not against *Episcopacy*) but against the *Italian* and *Diocesan frame*. The *Covenant* is not the thing that they are in danger of, but their own *Diseases*; we firmly believe that the *Covenant* bindeth us to nothing but what we were bound to if we had never taken it, as being not a *primary Bond* to make *new Duty*, but a *secondary* to bind

bind us to that only which is antecedently a duty; and that no *Vow* or *Covenant* bindeth us from obeying the *King* in any thing indifferent, much less a duty before. These are our Principles, however you *nauseate them.* But without respect to any *Vow* or *Covenant*, we hold that we are all bound (not to any Treason, Rebellion, or any illegal means; but) in our true Place and Calling to endeavour that those things may be reformed in the *Discipline*, which my first Dispute of *Church Government* hath proved to be evil. (After which so long unanswered, you need not so loudly have called for my Reasons:) And if this be it that maketh you think my *Retractions not sincere*, think what you please, I never *retracted* any of this.

§. 44. First, They that exercise the Keys of *Excommunication* and *Absolution* in the ordinary open Judicatures of the Land, are Church Governours: But *Lay Chancellors* exercise the Keys of *Excommunication* and *Absolution*, in the ordinary open Judicatures of the Land; *Ergo*, Lay-Chancellors are *Church-Governours.* 2. Who doubts but the *Et catera* included them. If it included *None*, it was superfluous: If *Any*, how exclude you them. And is it not said, [*As it standeth, and ought to stand.*] But were it but *Deans* and *Archdeacons*, I would not swear, that if the *King* commanded me by Writing or Petition to endeavour some alteration, I will resist or disobey him; you may do as you will. 3. It were too long now to tell you, how far I take my Conscience obliged to a *Lay-Chancellor*, and how far not. 4. But what's next? That [*no Learned*

ned men ſo much as maintain in the Schools, the Lay-Chancellors Church Government.] And yet have we *hot and feaveriſh heads*, if we will not ſwear to that which no man will maintain. Well! let it go for our Crime or Folly while ſuch men judge. 5. Add *p.* 20. *The fear of God is the beginning of wiſdom; a good underſtanding have all they that do them. — Fools make a mock of ſin. — See that ye walk circumſpectly, not as fools, but as wiſe.* To fear an *Oath* is a mark of the fear of God; and I am ſure to play with *Oaths* is a mark of the contrary. *God will not hold him guiltleſs that taketh his Name in vain.* All things by temptation may go for lawful to him, to whom Perjury, *deliberate ſtudied Perjury* ſeems lawful, yea and a *duty*. And avoiding the *name*, is no avoiding of the *thing*. He that will commit Murder, Adultery, Theft, *&c.* and then prove it to be no Murder, *&c.* doth not thereby eſcape the guilt: And he that is not willing to know Sin to be ſin that he may leave it, is wilful and wicked, as well as he that will not leave it, when he knoweth it. We do ſearch the Scripture to know what is *Perjury* as well as we can; And we are the leſs likely to be partial, when our judgment loſeth us the favour of ſo many, and our Maintenance, and Liberty, and in Priſons, hazardeth our Lives, beſides our Miniſtry, the moſt of all. Few men will take this way for the fleſh; yet this is no proof that our Cauſe is good: But let the Evidence ſhew, whether in fearing *Perjury* we fear [*a Serpent under every Leaf, or a Gorgons head in every Buſh, and bring this Woe upon our ſelves*] or not: If we do, it is not for worldly ends, nor is it by a

ſuper-

ſuperſtitious fear of things indifferent. If ſo many in Queen *Maries* days were burnt for denying the *Real Preſence*, &c. Shall I not fear *Perjury?*

§. 44. Next *p.* 20. you come to the *Liturgies Confeſſion*, that *our Diſcipline is imperfect*, and think that *ſhould ſatisfie me.* Anſ. So it doth ſatisfie me, not to aſſent and conſent to all things contained in and preſcribed by the Book of *Ordination* and the *Liturgie*, and not to forſwear all lawful endeavours of a Reformation; it ſeeming unmeet for me (whatever others do) to give ſo plenary *aſſent* and *conſent* thus to ſwear, to that which in the ſame Book is confeſt *imperfect*: I can live in Communion with a Church that hath imperfections, and keep its peace, but not *aſſent*, *conſent*, or *ſwear* to its *Imperfections*. 2. And you give me no reaſon yet, why a Confeſſion the imperfection of *Diſcipline* ſhould ſatisfie us that all things in the Church Government, or all Church-Government is both *lawful* and *neceſſary*, and *unalterable*: For if it be *alterable* by *King* and *Parliament*, I will not ſwear *never to endeavour an alteration*, though they command me: Nor will I believe you if you ſay that this Caſe (of their command) is excepted, while the terms are univerſal without exception; Remembring that the *long Parliament* long before the Wars, when the Lord *Falkland*, Lord *Digby*, and the reſt joyned with them, did exagitate the *Et cetera Oath*, for the word [*Not conſent*] as eſtabliſhing *Prelacy* as an unalterable thing; whereas they knew not but the *King* and *Parliament* might be brought to ſee cauſe for ſome alteration.

And

And this *Parliament* hath not reſtored that *Oath* (and *Canons*,)

Ib. §. 44. My Confutation of your horned Reaſoning, and of the common [*peralium*] I perceive offendeth you, *as triumphant*. It is natural for men that ſee plain truth, to be guilty of *calling it truth*: In this if we cannot be pardoned, we muſt be patient. *Truth* it ſelf is our *reward* and *ſatisfaction*. The force of my *Reply* you indeed leave intire and untoucht; For when you ſay, that you break my *Chain at the firſt Link*, you do but repeat what I replyed to, and put me but to ſay over again what I ſaid. You ſay that *Lay-Chancellors excommunicate neither as Lay-men*, or *as Clergy-men formally*, or *by any proper Cauſality, but from the Surrogates*.] *Anſw.* And were you willing here to be underſtood? *Either they do Excommunicate by proper Cauſality*, (without *cauſality* no Act is done) or they *do not*. If you mean that indeed *they do not*, why would you not ſay ſo, and deal plainly? If you mean they *Excommunicate* but [illegible] *Cauſality*, why would you not ſay ſo (which is moſt abſurd.) If they do it, they do it *formally* as *ſome perſons*, and in *ſome capacity*, and by ſome *power* or *right* whatever it is. That they do *Excommunicate* and *Abſolve* decretively, as the ſtated publick Judges, is notorious to the Land. That the Perſon in which they do it, is formally *Lay* or *Clergy*, I thought had been paſt doubt, and the *enumeration* had been ſufficient. But you do *dare tertium*, find out a *third Number*: He is formally neither *Lay* nor *Clergy*, but doth it from the *Surrogates*; See you not how you change the *Queſtion*, [*In what*

perſon he doth it] into [*from whom he doth it*] or make that [*from*] to ſignifie a *third Species*, which you could not or would not name: And when I ſay, that *if he do it from the Surrogate, yet he doth it either as a Lay-man or a Clergy-man*; you anſwer me as neither [*but from the Surrogate.*] You might have ſaid as well, *As neither, but from the King.* But who ever it is *from*, tell us of what *Species* that man is in acting, who is neither formally a *Lay-man*, nor a *Clergy-man*; whereas in our preſent ſence, as a *Clergy-man* ſignifieth,, *One in the Prieſthood or Deaconſhip, dedicated to the Sacred Church-Offices:* I eaſily prove that in the World there is no third ſort; becauſe the terms ſignifie *Oppoſita contradicentia, & contradictio eſt omnium oppoſitionum maxima, prima & reliquarum menſura.* For to be a *Lay-man*, is to be one that *is not devoted and ſeparated* as aforeſaid. And *Devotus & non devotus, ſeparatus ad ſacra & non ſeparatus, vel perſona ſacrata & non ſacrata*, are *contradicentia.* And if you allow me not to *ſwear* or *conform* till you prove that ſome men are neither *Lay* nor *Clergy*, you will be no ſucceſsful *Pithanalogiſt* with me. But I deſired to know who this *Surrogate* is that you mean, and you will not tell me: If you mean any one that is *abſent* and no *Member* of the *Court.* 1. The *Chancellor* hath his power from no ſuch man as is notorious. 2. You might better ſay, that he had it from the *Biſhop:* But ſtill I ſhould ask in what perſon he acted, and whether as a *Lay* or a *Clergy-man.* But if you mean the *Prieſt preſent who pronounceth the ſentence*, I never heard that he was *called the Surrogate* till now:

But

But call him how you will ; 1. It is notorious that he giveth not the *Chancellor* his power at all. 2. And as *notorious* that he hath not, nor exerciſeth the power himſelf: But to *judge any man to Excommunication* or *Abſolution*, is the *Chancellors* part ; and the preſent *Prieſt* is but like the Pariſh *Prieſt*, who readeth or ſpeaketh (as a Cryer) what the Chancellor judgeth and ordereth: And whether ſuch Prieſt be any Member of the *Court*, or conſtantly uſed, I leave to your Enquiry ; but certainly he is no Judge at all, nor doth any thing but pronounce as he is bid. And ſtill my Arguing is unanſwered: For had this *Presbyter* the *power*, it would be either as a *Presbyter*, or as a *Biſhop*. Not as a *Presbyter*, ſay the *Prelatiſts*; for then it will ſet *Presbyters* too high, or rather take hundreds from that which belongeth to their Office, whilſt one in the ſame Office exerciſeth the *Keys* upon all their people and themſelves that are his equals: *Et par in parem non habet poteſtatem.* Not as *Biſhops*, for they are not ſuch really, and the *Epiſcopacy* cannot be delegated, as I proved. You ſaid (which I am glad of) *That it may be you could wiſh that Excommunication were reduced into a more Scriptural, Apoſtolical, and Primitive Channel as much as my ſelf. But you never look that the Church below ſhould be without ſpot or wrinkle.*] *Anſw.* You ſpeak here ſo well, that it half reconcileth us: If ſo, then the main difference left is, (not whether we ſhall live peaceably in ſuch a Church, or promiſe to do ſo; for that I have oft done, yea and did ſubſcribe to the *Archbiſhop* that now is, (when he gave me a Licence to Preach, and I could have had it without ſub-

ſcribing a word) that I would not Preach againſt the *Doctrine, Liturgy*, or *Ceremonies* of the *Church:* But) whether I may deliberately give *my hand and profeſſion* that I *aſſent* and *conſent* to ſuch a *frame*, and may *ſwear that I will not any time endeavour an alteration of that Government, which runs not in the Scriptural, Apoſtolick, Primitive Channel, nor of its acknowledged ſpots and wrinkles:* That is, To *promiſe* or *ſwear that I will not obey God, nor ſeek the Reformation of any ſuch thing in his Church, which is acknowledged amiſs, no not in my place and calling, and by any lawful means.* Whereas in my *Baptiſm* I vowed my ſelf and ſervice to Chriſt as the Saviour of his Body; and in my *Ordination* I vowed my ſelf to him as a Miniſter; and I daily pray for the hallowing of his Name, the coming of his Kingdom, the doing of his Will on Earth even as it is done in Heaven: And therefore will not by ſwearing to the contrary, renounce my *Baptiſm*, *Miniſtery*, or *Prayers.* (Pardon the deſcription of the Sin as it would be to me: I do not ſay, that it is ſuch in you, or another that ſeeth not what I ſee.) Good Meanings and Latitudes, and ſtretching Expoſitions, will not make this paſs with me among things indifferent. And (for your own ſake, not mine, who ſtand or fall to a higher Tribunal:) I entreat you to judge of us in this as of men that are dying daily, and neer a World where Preferments and Wealth, and humane Favour ſignifie nothing; and who are ſo unwilling to neglect our undertaken Office for mens Souls, that we offer our Superiours to take it joyfully as a Favour to be any way puniſhed for this ſuppoſed

Sin

Sin (of not *lying* nor being *perjur'd*) ſo it may not hinder us from Preaching the *Goſpel of Salvation*; Even to be puniſhed as deeply as common Swearers, Drunkards, or Adulterers are; to rid Channels, to Dig or Plow, or to be burnt in the hand as Felons are, or our Ears bored or cropt as Rogues or perjur'd Perſons are, ſo we may but Preach Chriſt, or ſee the Kingdoms ſo ſupplyed, as that our Labours may be truly needleſs to mens Salvation. I would take all this thankfully on my Knees: much more be denied the *Levites Bread*, or *Miniſterial Maintenance*. But theſe are too high Favours for ſuch as we to hope for in ſuch a time, and from ſuch Perſons, as Experience proveth; except that the Clemency of the *King* vouchſafeth us ſome convenience, againſt the will of ſuch of the *Clergy* as you: Nothing but either *Debauching* our *Conſciences*, and *ſtretching them ſo wide, as that any thing will afterward go down*; or elſe deſerting the *Preaching of Chriſt for mens Salvation*, will ſerve with ſome men that I have talkt with: (For it is not my Superiours now that I am ſpeaking of;) I did all that I was able *unfeignedly*, to have brought all men once to *Union* with the *Church*, upon any other terms than theſe, when the thing was feaſible as to the moſt: But——was an Enemy, and one that deſerved ſhame and ruine for it. But I am gone back: To return.——

I am glad alſo that you ſay, *That the Surrogates have the power of the Keys*; and indeed ſo moſt School-men ſay, and ſo *Spalatenſis* hath notably and oft proved: But what it will infer againſt *Biſhops*, denying them to all the *Presbyters* in a

whole *Dioceſs*, ſave one or two, or few: I will not repeat.

You ſay, *I did not well to overlook what you ſaid about Chancellour's Skill in the Civil Law, &c.*] *Anſw.* I did not overlook it, but paſt it by as an Impertinency, ſuppoſing we had been agreed: 1. That the holy Scriptures are the *Univerſal Rule* of *Church Diſcipline* as to the *Eſſentials*, and the *Laws* of the *Land*, and *Canonical Agreements*, the ſubſervient Rules about Circumſtances, and Adjuncts, and for the execution of the former. 2. And that Ability in Scriptures (much leſs in the Roman Laws) doth give no man authority to the exerciſe of the *Spiritual Keys* without a Call, being but his remote Capacity. 3. And that he that is called hereunto is called to be a *Clergy-man*, to whome the *Keys* are proper. I pray you, Sir, deny none of this: (Let Begging this once go inſtead of Arguing. 4. And he may be fit to Adviſe and Aſſiſt a *Biſhop* that is himſelf no *Clergy man*; but *Adviſing* and *judicial Decreeing* are ſeveral things. 5. And I am weary with ſaying, that we ſubmit to *Chancellors* as *Magiſtrates*, doing that which belongeth to *Magiſtrates*, according to the ſenſe of the *Oath of Supremacy*. But what's all this to our Caſe in hand?] You add, [*Tell me, Sir, may not a man be ſaid to do that virtually, which he doth not immediately.*] *Anſw.* Yes, a man may pay a Debt by his Servant, or Deputy; but not Baptize or Adminiſter the Lords Supper, or Diſcipline by another, becauſe Chriſt hath annexed the *Office* to the *Perſon*, and the *Office* is an *Obligation* and *Authority* to do the work.

You

You add, [*The King doth neither Preach, nor Administer Sacraments, yet hath a Supremacy of Power in all things belonging to the Church.*] *Answ.* Now I cannot follow you so far, as to believe that the King doth *virtually Administer the Sacraments per alios:* At least I durst not *swear* it. If you think it is but a *Gorgons head that affrighteth me*; hear and judge: 1. Christ gave the *Keys* immediately to Ministers, and not to Kings, and distinguished their Offices. 2. Queen *Elizabeth*' K. *James*, and the *Convocation* have publickly disclaimed such a sense of the *Oath of Supremacy*, and taken it for the *Papists slanders*, and disclaimed such a Power of the *Keys* in the King, and so hath our present King (wisely) in my hearing. 3. Some *Scots* are well charged with an injurious refusal of the *Oath of Supremacy*, on the account of such a false Exposition; which is the *Papists* Case. 4. Almost all the *Papists* and *Protestants* in the World that ever I heard or read, are agreed, that the King hath not the said Power of the Spiritual Keys and Sacraments. 5. And specially the most learned and zealous Defenders of Monarchy and Prelacy: *Bilson* of *Chest. Obed.* and *Perp. Gov.* and *Andrews in Tortura Torti*, have most plainly and vehemently renounced it, and shewed their malice or ignorance, that impute such an Arrogation to our Kings: So also *Carlton* of *Jurisdic. Jewel, Whitaker*, and who not. 6. What a King may do *virtually by another*, I think (unless Inconveniencies hinder the exercise) he hath power to do himself. But I think the King may not Administer Sacraments or Spiritual Discipline himself: Which of our

Kings did it? Or who since *Uzziah* offered Sacrifice among the *Jews*. 7. Our Kings never yet pretended so much as to *Ordain*; that is, to Invest another in that Power Ministerially in the Name of Christ. But as to the *Supremacy*, it's true, that the *King* is the *Supream* over *Physicians*, *Philosophers*, &c. but not the Supream *Physician* or *Philosopher*: He exerciseth Coercive Government by the Sword over *Bishops* who use *Spiritual Government* by the *Keys* and *Word*; but hath not *Authority* to use this same sort of oversight himself (unless a *Clergy-man* were *King*, as some are *Magistrates*.) As to the *Proxies of the Lords Spiritual in Parliament*, when you have as well proved that Christ hath allowed them to Preach, Administer Sacraments, and exercise the *Keys* by *Proxies*, I will yield all that Cause: But they will be loath to go to *Heaven* by *Proxy*.

Page 21. As to *Jehoshaphats Mission*, *and his Nobles Teaching*; I answer, 1. *Teaching* is not so proper to a *Pastor* or *Clergy-man*, as the *Keys* and *Sacraments*: Parents have their Office or Power of *teaching*, and School-masters and Lay Catechists have theirs, and Magistrates have theirs: Judges on the Bench do usually teach the People, even religious Duties; so did *Constantine*, and so may any *King*. But there is a different *teaching* whith is *proper* to the *Clergy*; which is [*by teaching to gather Churches, and guide them, and edifie them as Pastors, devoted or separated to this as their proper Office.*] As there is a difference between the Office of a Physician and a Womans healing a *cut finger*, or giving a Cordial to one that fainteth. But this *proper Teaching* (which God did not

not leave in common to others) no *Prince* can uſe, no *Biſhop* can do by *Proxy*; Nor can he delegate to a *Lay-man* the power of the *Keys* and *Sacraments*. 2. And the *King* may no doubt command *Paſtors* to do their Duty as well as *Phyſicians* to do theirs. I take none of this to be *quarrelling*, but *plain truth*: Your telling us that *Chancellors may direct and adviſe the Surrogates*, may ſignifie ſomething in another Land, but not with us: If we had never ſeen their *Courts*, nor read *Travers, Of the difference between Chriſts Diſcipline and theirs*; yet *Couſin's Tables* are in our *Libraries*.

You add, [*We are all but the Biſhops Curates in the exerciſe of it.*] *Anſw.* 1. I ventured to deny that to *Bagſhaw* who made it the Reaſon of Separation: And I will yet deny it of ſome others, though not of you. If we are all but the *Biſhops Curates*; the *Italian Biſhops* of *Trent* were not ſo abſurd as they were made in making the *Biſhops* the *Popes Curates*. How eaſie ſhould I be, were I a *Curate*, could I believe that I have no more to anſwer for, than the *Biſhop* impoſed on me, and that he muſt anſwer for all the reſt. I ſuppoſe that the Office of the *Presbyters* or *Miniſters* of Chriſt is immediately Inſtituted and deſcribed in the Scriptures, and that the *Biſhop* doth but Inveſt them in it, and that their work is their own, as properly as the *Biſhop's* is his own, and that his Preeminence, maketh not him the *Communicator* of the Power to them as from himſelf, nor them to be his *Curates*. 2. And while I think that I can prove this very eaſily,

cenſure

censure us not too deeply for not *swearing to the Bishops*, if the sence of it be, to make us his *Curates*. Not that I think my self too good to be a Servant to the *Bishop's* Coach man, but that I dare not subvert Christ's established *Church Orders*.

As for your [*Engine, and Wonders, and Babel, and* Lucifer, *and trembling*] I have not learning enough to answer them. As to your talk of *Absolute Autocratical, &c.* they are but *Oratorical Flowers*, that speak against none of our particular Doctrines, but are the *rant* of your *Magisterial style*. And your talk of *Excommunicating Kings*, may pass as part of your *equal ways*, to one that hath written so oft against *Excommunicating Kings*, (when yet *Bishop Andrews* and other *Prelates* maintain the Refusing them the *Communion*; and you know in what Case *Chrysostom* rather offered to lose Hand and Life, even then to give the *Sacrament* to the Greatest that was unworthy. Prove that ever any of the present *Non-conformists*, who were called to present the judgment or desires of the rest, did ever say more than *Andrews* and *Bilson*, or so much. But the Lord *Digby is your Author*. *Answ.* 1. Were we and our present *Controversie*, (for the most of us) in *being*, and at *age* when the Lord *Digby* spake that? Is not *Conformity* now another thing? Do all or half the *Non-conformists* profess themselves *Presbyterians?* Are *Presbyterians* all for Excommunicating *Kings?* And do not some that are for it, confine it only to such Pastors as Kings themselves shall commit their Souls to, and give leave to exercise that Power? Are we, I say, *we now living, and silenced*, answerable for all that any

Pref-

Presbyterian holdeth, any more than you are for what *Hooker* holdeth? Some *Scots-men* refuse the *Oath of Supremacy*. Are we guilty of that Mistake, who Take it, and Write for it? Or did we spring out of their Loins, and must be silenced for such *Original sin*, derived from them that were no kin to us? 2. But where did the Lord *Digby* say it? You cite no Book or Speech of his; but cite *Rushworth*, *p.* 218. Where is no syllable of any such matter, nor any where else that I can yet find. 3. Suppose he had; Did he not say in his Letter to Sir *Ken. Digby* Printed, That the *Primitive Church Government* will be found *pecking towards Presbytery*: He was then *Episcopal*, he is now a *Papist*. Is not his Authority then *ad hominem*, while he was one of your own, more valued against you than against them that were not of his Party or way, and is this good arguing? [Whatever the Lord *Digby*, *Bancroft*, *Heylin*, (and if you will *Bellarmine*) charge the *Presbyterians* with 1640, or I know not when or where, all that are the *Non-conformists*, *Episcopal*, *Presbyterians*, *Independents*, and *Catholick* Moderators are guilty of in 1671. But the Lord *Digby* sometimes said, that the *Presbyterians* would *Excommunicate Kings*: *Ergo*, the present *Nonconformists*, even *Episcopal* and all, are guilty of that Opinion, even they that write against it.] But all your ways are just and equal: But I pray you, why was no Article about Excommunicating *Kings* offered us as a *Test*? or why was there never any such difference between us and the *Prelatists* pretended? Try us whether we will not subscribe in this to, as much as the *Prelatists* ever-

ver did agree on, or ordinarily hold, and lay our Liberty upon it, and ſpare not. But I remember you nibled before at my words in *Differ.* of *Magiſt.* and *Paſtors power*, *Theſ.* 60. *p.* 38. as if I had ſaid, That [*unleſs perhaps in ſome rare Caſe, Kings may not be Excommunicated.*] A Calumny, when I annexed thoſe words of exception only to the *Excommunicating of Parents.* But your ways are ſtill equal! And I gave even Moral Reaſons againſt Excommunicating Kings and Parents. But when you in *ſwearing* will put (who knows how many) Exceptions to expreſs *Univerſals*, muſt I after all this be at your mercy, unleſs I will ſay, that [*In no rare caſe a Paſtor may Excommunicate his own Parents.*] What if the rare Caſe were 1. That he were but one in a *Presbytery* ſubject to a *Biſhop*, and his Parents were as open Apoſtates as *Julian*, and the *Biſhop* and the reſt of the *Preſbytery* required him to concur in their Excommunication? 2. What if the King command a Biſhop to Excommunicate a Magiſtrate or Parent for *Treaſon?* Muſt he needs be diſobeyed. 3. What if God ſhould ſend an Angel or Prophet with a particular Meſſage ſo to do? I am ſure that Caſe is rare enough, and I durſt not diſobey. But its hard pleaſing ſome men.

§ 45. *Semper idem?* 1. But will you give it under your hand as a Leſſon to your Flock, *That a Miniſter may not gainſay another for ſlandering Chriſtians, who in any thing differ from him that doth gainſay him; nor may defend the Innocency of a Presbyterian, unleſs he be one himſelf?* And that *all men are bound to ſtand to the Opinions of all Chriſtians in all other points, whom they ſeek to vindicate*

againſt

againſt publick ſlanders. What a pack of *Doctrines* do the Reaſonings of theſe your Writings imply if they were but ſet together. If I write almoſt twenty years ago, and ſtill againſt *Lay Elders*, a Conformiſt may *equally* charge that upon me which I write againſt, if I do but plead againſt ſlandering thoſe that hold what I diſſent from. Yea [he knoweth not where to have us] ſo little do our Writings ſignifie our minds in theſe mens account. The firſt *Epiſt.* to *Kederm.* in the firſt Book that ever I wrote, diſclaims them: But that's nothing to you. And I muſt be taken for the *Achilles* of the *Party*, and accountable for their *Opinions*; if I do but ſay to a Printing Conformiſt, [*Thou ſhalt not bear falſe witneſs againſt thy Neighbour.*] May I not ſay ſo to you for a *Heathen* or a *Papiſt.* Dr. *Heylin* tells us in the Life of Archbiſhop *Laud*, That the *Kings Printers* were cenſured ſorely for Printing the Seventh Commandment [*Thou ſhalt commit Adultery.*] But I never yet met with the Ninth Commandment ſo tranſmuted, to give you any excuſe: If you think it lawful to ſay *any thing* how unjuſt ſoever againſt a man that is not for your *Diſcipline* (which you as much wiſh amended your ſelf) I am of another mind. When *Lamprid.* tells us, that *Alex Severus* borrowed his *Motto* of the Chriſtians, *Quod tibi fieri non vis, &c.* He never ſaid that therefore he was a Chriſtian. I had got no Lawyer to plead for me at the Bar, if they had known that they were accountable for all my Opinions. I am ſure the Lord Chief Juſtice when he acquit me, thought fit to declare his different judgment from mine in point

of

of Preaching privately: Yet here your terms of *Logick* are, [*Into how many shapes*—and *Hecatetriformis*—*Fish, flesh, Mermaid, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independent*; *yet none of these when you please an Amphibion, sometimes in the water, sometimes out*; *I wish you were hot or cold.*] All this set together would make a *Syllogism* of a *new Mood* and *Figure*. But 1. For ought I know most of the *Nonconformists* are such are your bungling description intimateth: And whatever men hold, take it as it is, and feign them not to hold what they do not. Do not you in Print proclaim men to be *flesh* or *fish*, hot or cold, that are not so? But lay our Error where it lieth (even as I must not take your Chancellors for Clergy-men or Laymen.) 2. And did not all my tedious writings convince you before now? that I therefore take that for an *honour* which you take for my *disgrace*; because I take that for plain and certain truth, which you reproach,: You could not (except a Catholick Christian) have trulier called me, than an *Episcopal-Presbyterian-Independent*. I have oft enough told the World, that I am very confident that each of the three Parties have some *Truths* and some *Errors* appropriate to themselves, or which the rest have not. I never found in Scripture any Obligation that I must needs be of a *Faction*, in a time when *Faction* hath bred *Wars*, troubled *Kingdoms*, silenced *Preachers* by the hundreds, *&c.* and when I have seen and felt the Effects, and not been always innocent of the Cause: Nor yet that I must either refuse all the *good*, or receive all the *bad*, and feed on the excrements of any Faction whatsoever; I

am

am for no ſuch heats or cold; I am no ſuch fiſh or fleſh: I will neither perſecute as *Paul* did, nor ſeparate as *Peter* did, *Gal.* 2. nor comply as *Barnabas* did, nor reject the Brethren as *Diotrephes* did, nor condemn others as the Weak did, nor deſpiſe them as the ſtrong did, *Rom.* 14. 1, 2, *&c.* But be ſuch an ἀμφίτον, as he that became a *Jew*, a *Greek*, *all things to all men that he might win ſome.* When I offended the Biſhops in Conference, I openly told them, I had ever taken kneeling at the Sacrament to be lawful, but I never took it to be lawful to caſt honeſt Chriſtians out of the Communion of the Church of Chriſt, that dare not do it. Did this prove me to be neither *fiſh* nor *fleſh?* Is no man of your Religion that is not for Excommunication, or Priſons, Swords or Flames, for every Child of God that cryeth or wrangleth with the Breaſt. Again I will ſay, were they *Priſcillianiſts*, I am more for *Martin's Spirit* than the *Ithacian Biſhops.* And, Sir, that factious fury and uncharitableneſs keepeth up but a preſent violent kind of honour; the Inſtance now once again named may tell you, that when all the Biſhops thereabouts in their Synods did but ſeek to the Magiſtrate to uſe the Sword againſt ſuch groſs Hereticks as the *Priſcillianiſts*, who as *Severus* ſaith that knew them, were *Gnoſticks*, and but one poor ragged unlearned godly Biſhop *Martin*, (with one other only in all *France*) did diſſent from them, reprove them, and ſeparate for it from their Synods and Communion (Godly people accidentally falling under the Vulgars reproach for the Hereticks ſake, as lately by the word *Puritans* here) yet this

this one poor Bishop that renounced all their Communions for it, is Canonized a Saint, while *Hooker* himself justly reproacheth *Ignatius*. And it made me marvail to read in *Bellarmine de Script. Eccles. pag.* 100. this great Lie that *Ithacius* (whom he falsly makes the same with *Idacius*, who was one of the same *Synod*, and Author of the *Chron. in Jos. Scaliger de emend. temp.*) *In eo reprehensus & punitus ab Episcopis fuit, quod Priscillianum apud seculares judices accusaverit & occidi curaverit.*] Whenas 1. The *Bishops* never punished him for it. 2. The *Synod* of *Bishops* joyned with him. 3. *Martin* was despised as an unlearned Hypocrite, and Favourer of the *Hereticks* that did renounce their way and Communion. 4. *Ithacius* and *Idacius* because of the common *Odium*, would have pretended that they put not on the Magistrate hereunto: And that *Bellarmine* one of the *Tribe* that is for *burning Hereticks*, should yet leave this *blot* on *Idacius*, and seek by *untruths* to excuse the rest of the *Bishops* of it; whence is it, but that the *Memory of the just shall be blessed, and the Name of the wicked* (the cruel especially) *shall rot*. I digress only to tell you, that the *honour of violence will end in shame*, and he be odious to Posterity, who may be set up as high as *Gardiner* or *Bonner*, to serve the turn in some present *Execution*: And I had rather be *luke-warm*, than have a *destroying* or *slandering heat*.

To what you say of *Beza* and *Selden*, I answer, 1. Did I or the present *Nonconformists* ever subscribe to *Beza* or *Geneva*. 2. Is it not palpably against your self, that cry down *Lay Elders*,

Elders, (though many with Miniſters have power but in one *Presbytery* or *Synod*) when our *Lay Chancellor* hath the power over hundreds of *Miniſters* and *Churches*. You that cry up or keep up *Lay-mens Church Diſcipline*, may worſe ſpeak againſt *Lay-mens Church Diſcipline*, than we that are againſt it in all whomſoever. 3. But *Beza* and *Geneva* do not take them for *Lay Elders*, nor the *Scots* neither, but for *Church Elders*, and part of the *Clergy* of *Divine Inſtitution*; none of which is pretended for *Lay Chancellors*. And is that no difference? For *Selden* as I know what he ſaith againſt the *Dioceſan Church*, *Biſhops* in *Eutychius Alexandr.* So I know what he ſaith againſt all of us for *Eraſtianiſm de Synedriis*, better than by any Citations out of *Heylin*. And I know he was one of the *Long Parliament* that raiſed the War, whom even now you had poſſeſſed with the *Spirit of Presbytery*: And you may judge of many of the reſt by *Selden*. And muſt you or I be *Eraſtians* becauſe *Selden* (and other *Lawyers* in the *Parliament*) were ſo.

§. 46. The *Quibble* in this *Section* is Content without an Anſwer.

§. 47. I judged but of your *Words*, and judge you of my *Motives* for *refuſing* a *Biſhopriek* no worſe than I give you cauſe. I anſwer you, it intimated no Ingratitude to His Majeſty, nor did I ever repent: And that I did it not to keep up a Party or Intereſt in them, the *Lord Chancellor* had *Evidence*; and my *voluntary endeavours* againſt all *Faction*, and caſting away my *Reputation* with all ſuch, declareth; when I could as eaſily have kept it, as you with yours, and had

no outward interest to move me to renounce it. I say this, because you seem suspectingly to talk of my *Motives*.

§. 48. Our *Question* is, Whether a *Church* of *One Altar* (as they spake of old) Associated for *personal Communion*, and a *Church* of never so many *Altars* or *Congregations* Associated for other ends, and not for *personal Communion* be *ejusdem speciei?* And so, whether the word *Church* here signifies but one *Species?* You hold the Affirmative of both, and I the Negative. My reason is, 1. Because it being a Relative which is in question, [*The ends of the Society specifically differing, make the Societies specifically to differ,* (the *Terminus being essential to the Relation.*) But *here are different sorts of ends:* Ergo, *here are different sorts of Relations.* I use the word (*ends*) to signifie the *neerest end* which specifieth, and not the remote. And to avoid the ambiguity of the word [*Terminus*] which (as *Finis cujus & finis cui* are distinguished, so) they use variously, sometimes for the *Correlate*, and sometimes for the *neerest end*; and so I now use it. As a Master to teach a *Grammar-school*, and a Master to rule a *Family*, or to guide a *Ship*, are Relations specifically distinct *a fine:* And so is a *Magistrate*, and a *Pastor*, and a *Physician*, &c. This is clear. And for the *Minor*, That these *Churches* in question have different neerest ends is evident: For the end of a *particular Church* is *personal communion in God's publick Worship and holy living*, and *their mutual assistance*. But the ends of *Churches* that never know each other, but live an 100 or 1000 Miles asunder, (They say some of our *Islands* and

and *Plantations* are parts of some *English Diocesan Church*) can be no such thing, but only a *distant communion* in the same *Faith, Love* and *Obedience*. The end of a single Church is the personal Communion of Christians in that one Society. The end of an Association of many Churches, is the Communion of those many Churches in distant mental Concord, or by *Delegates* or *Synods* sometimes in case of need. And who ever thought that a particular Church, a Patriarchal Church, and a Papal or the Universal Church, were *ejusdem speciei*, when they agree only in remote ends, and differ in the *Terminus vel finis proximus*. As a Kingdom and a Corporation differ *Ex differentiâ specifica*; because though both are Societies for Civil Communion and Government, and so agree *in genere*, yet the end of one is *Kingdom-government* and *Communion*; and the end of the other is but *Corporation-government* and *Communion*. 2. Where there are different sorts of *Relates & correlates*, there are different sorts of *Relations*: But in a particular Church, and a Patriarchal, Diocesan, or other Combination of many Churches, there are different sorts of *Relates & correlates*: *Ergo*, there are different sorts of *Relations*. The thing supposed in the *major* is undeniable, that the *Relate & correlate* enter the definition; therefore the *major* is undeniable. The *minor* supposeth a Church to be Constituted of the *pars dirigens vel regens*, and the *pars subdita*, as *relate & correlate*, which is undeniable. And then it is proved *per partes*. 1. The Pastor of a single Church, and a Patriarch, Pope, or Diocesan of a multitude of combined Churches, are not

the ſame *Relate*, for they have not the ſame *Re-*
lation: (I ſuppoſe the *Relation* of a *Church* to be
thus Conſtitute of the two Complicate Relations,
as well the Church ſubjectively of the two *Re-*
lates.) For, 1. The different Work. 2. And
the different *Correlate*, prove theſe Paſtors to be
two ſorts of Relation (however agreeing *in ge-*
nere.) 1. It is not the ſame ſort of *Works* perſo-
nally to guide a preſent people in *Doctrine*, *Wor-*
ſhip, and *Diſcipline* (under Chriſt as *Prophet*,
Prieſt, *King*, all eſſential to the Office) as to
ſend others as his Curates to do this: (For the
King may ſend others,) or to exerciſe ſome
degree of Diſcipline himſelf over many Chur-
ches, where he is none of their Teacher, nor
Mouth, nor Guide in Worſhip, Prayer, Praiſe,
Sacraments, *&c.* Nor is it the ſame work to be an
unuſual Teacher (as one may be in another
Church or School) and to be the ſtated ordinary
Teacher and Worſhipper of that Churrh which
is the end of the particular Paſtors Office. 2. And
the *Correlate* proveth the difference: For it is
not the ſame Relation to be a Ruler of a Family,
and of a Kingdom; and ſo here: which brings
me to the proof of the *Minor* by the ſecond part.
And that the *Correlates* are various is evident, not
only from the *magnitude*, but *the end* alſo that
included: For the ſubject of Political Society
(*Civitatis vel Eccleſiæ*) is a *Community*, not any
multitude of men: Becauſe that which *Ariſtotle*
calleth *Privatio*, and is better called *Diſpoſitio*
materiæ, is neceſſary as a kind of Principle to the
reception of the Form. (As in *Phyſicks*, ſo *quid*
analogum in *Relations*:) And therefore it muſt be
a Com-

Community. Now Communities themſelves are firſt ſpecified by their various ends: As a Company of men combined for *Merchandize*, and a Company combined for *Literature*, or for *Souldiery*, *&c.* are not the ſame: So a Company combined for Perſonal Communion and helps in holy Worſhip and living, are not the ſame with thoſe combined for other ends as aforeſaid. Therefore neither the *Paſtors* nor *Peoples Relation*, and conſequently the *Churches*, is not of the ſame ſort. Where there are diſtinct *Fundamenta vel rationes fundandi*, there are diſtinct *Relations*: But where are diſtinct *fundamenta*, *&c.* The *fundamentum* is, 1. Principall, which is *Inſtitution* (Divine or Humane.) 2. Subordinate, which is *Conſent*: *Viz.* 1. Of a *Miniſter* to gather *Churches*, *Conſenſus duplex Dei & Miniſtri.* 2. Of a *Miniſter* to guide *Churches* gathered, *Conſenſus triplex & plerumque quadruplex*; *viz.* 1. *Dei.* 2. *Ordinati.* 3. *Populi.* 4. *Plerumque Ordinantis.* If any of theſe vary, the *Fundamentum relationis* it ſelf ſo far vary; were it not tedious I would ſhew, you how much difference there is in all theſe. But it is the *firſt Reaſon*, that being moſt evident, I moſt inſiſt on.

Now your Reaſon to the contrary (for your Affirmative) is, that *Gradus non variat ſpeciem.* To which my Anſwer being, that *Quando variat aut finem proximum, ſeu terminum, vel fundamentum, vel relatum correlatum, variat relationis ſpeciem.* But frequently *Gradus materiæ, variat finem proximum fundamentum, &c. Ergo, & ſpeciem.* The *Major* needeth no proof; the *Minor* I cleared by the inſtance of a Ship, a Church, a

Spoon, &c. where magnitude or parvity can make this difference. You tell me *Relatives* do not *ſuſcipere magis & minus*. *Anſw.* The clean contrary is an uſual *Maxim* with *Logicians*: But that is ſo plain that it needs no diſpute; *viz. Quoad ſubjectum (& fundamentum aliquando) & materiam correlati*; It may be found in divers degrees, but not in degrees of matter uncapable of the *End* and *Form*: But the *forma Relativa* doth not ſo vary; one is not *magis vel minus hæc relatio*, than another. But if you will extend this to the Matter of the Subject, which is our Caſe, you do but (though miſtakingly) give away your Cauſe: For then every new Member maketh a new Church *in ſpecie*, (when you ſay) [*This is only in reſpect of quantity*;] You know that *Ariſtotle* ſaith, That *Quantity non ſuſcipit magis & minus*, and ſo his Interpreters ſay, ſpeaking ſtrictly and not laxly: Therefore it's this you muſt mean as I do, while you would ſay ſomething that we may ſeem to differ. I told you, that *different quantities in the Subject may change the relations*, which I think never man denied that underſtood what a *Relation* was. And you feign me to ſay ſimply [That *Magis & minus variant ſpeciem in relatives*:] That you may have occaſion to ſay as I ſaid, under pretence of contradicting the ſame thing. But to my Inſtances, you ſay, *That it is enough for your purpoſe that there is not a ſpecifick difference between a little Spoon or Dioceſs, and a great one.*] *Anſw.* Say you ſo; our *Queſtion* is, *Whether different Degrees in the Subject may vary the Species of Relations?* Either you deny it, or you do not: If you do,

common

common Experience and Reaſon will ſhame your denial. I inſtanced in a *Spoon*, a *Church*, a *Troop*, *Regiment*, *Army*, a *Ship*, *&c.* Whereſoever the *finis proximus* (as in all Offices and Societies) is eſſential to the Relation, there no man of Logical acquaintance can make a doubt of it, but that certain Quantities or Degrees in the Subject may be ſo over great or over ſmall, as to be uncapable of that *End*, and conſequently of the *Relation*. I will not cenſure you to be ſo ignorant as to doubt of it; and if I do not, you force me to judge you ſo heedleſs or partial as to ſay ſomething towards the hiding of that truth which you do not doubt of: I ſay, that Degrees in the Subject or Correlate vary not the Species, but when they vary the *ſpecifying end:* ſome *Relations* are founded only in Actions *paſt*; as *Pater & filius* in Generation, *Creator & creatura* in Creation: And there the end following is not eſſential. But it is otherwiſe with thoſe Relations which conſiſt in an *Authority*, *Obligation*, *undertaking of a future work*, (as a *Teacher*, *Phyſician*, *&c.*) where the *Work* as *undertaken* is the *eſſential end*. And you had here no better a ſhift then to diſſemble in ſilence the other *Inſtances*; and to tell me, that [*a great Spoon and a little one differ not* ſpecie:] But doth that prove, that it may be *in ſpecie* a *Spoon*, if if be as big as a *Ship*, or *in ſpecie* a *Ship*, if it be no bigger than a *Spoon*: Since you perceive your own deceit, which is by transferring the *Queſtion*, *à re ad nomen*, and then by chooſing Inſtances *de nomine*, where the Name is never uſed *generically*, but only for one *ſpecies*. The name of a *Spoon* is never taken for a Ship, *& contra*:

And therefore to ſay, that a little Spoon and a greater differ not *ſpecie*, is but to ſay, that the ſame *ſpecies* is *the ſame*, as being found in a capable degree of ſubject. But a Society, a Church, yea a Dioceſs, are names (generical or analogous) which may be and are applyed to various Species. The univerſal Church headed by Chriſt, is no more of the ſame ſpecies with a particular Church, than a Kingdom, and a Corporation in that Kingdom are. I uſe not words to *hide things*, but to render them *intelligible*. A thouſand Schools combined under a general Schoolmaſter, or an hundred Colledges making up one *Academy*, are not of the ſame ſpecies with one School, and one Colledge, though in the great remote end they both agree. But you fly to that poor ſhift of bidding me *take heed of abſurd and ridiculous Suppoſitions, not argumentative, &c.*] As if you had ſhewed any abſurdity in theſe Suppoſitions: Or as if plain undeniable Inſtances had no place in Arguments or Anſwers, but were ridiculous Suppoſitions; and he that would ſay, that a Kingdom is greater than a Family, and the King than a Maſter or Major, uſed a ridiculous Suppoſition. Juſt thus the poor *Nonconformiſts* are perſwaded by your *Pithonalogy*, to *ſubſcribe, ſwear, &c.* But *I ſeem* (you ſay) *to aſſert this my ſelf*, by ſaying, *there is a ſmall difference between Biſhop* Uſher's *Model and the preſent.*] *Anſw.* It's tedious diſputing with one that muſt have ſtill another Writing to help him to underſtand that which he will firſt confute, yea and ſeemeth not *willing* to underſtand. It is a fallacy, *A dicte ſecundum quid ad dictum ſimpliciter*: I only askt you,

What

What Farthing doth it take from their Estates? What Title from their Honour, Power, Negative voice: (even their *Lordships and Parliament places.*) But is this the *Question?* We then laboured to satisfie the *unsatisfied Ministers*, that not only Bishop *Usher's* Reduction, but even the King's Declaration about *Ecclesiastical Affairs*, had changed the very *species* of *Prelacy* without any of those Abatements. If you would know, it is by one word [*Consent*] restoring the inferiour Pastors and Churches, though not to their *Integrals*, yet to their *Essentials*. And we were so inclinable to Conformity, that on that *supposition* we had Conformed, had but that *Declaration* stood: (though some of the *Sects* are of another mind, whom your Arguments would confirm:) For we judge, that a *Bishop* of one only Church consisting of five hundred or a thousand Chappels or Congregations that are strictly no Churches (as having no *Bishops*) doth *specifically* differ from a *Bishop* of a thousand Churches, which have every one their proper *Bishop*, and so he is truly an *Archbishop* or *General Bishop*. But I am not to trouble you with this.

And now how impertinent was it, to bid me [*Rub up my Philosophy* about *Maximum quod sic & minimum quod non.*] Know you not, that the common use of those *Writers* are to intimate the same thing that I am saying against you; That there is a subjective *maximum & minimum*, which only are capable of the *relative form?* But I am next turned to *Vossius de invoc. Sanct.* of which he hath there disputed, and one *Histor. Thes.* and I am not told which (*of them*) but the words

are

are in the first *Thes.* 49. to prove that the Saints in Heaven and those on Earth make one Society: [*Quare cum nihil obstat quo minus unius civitatis cives dicamur, nec causæ quicquam erit, quo minus æque civilis honos dicatur, qui civibus cœlestibus exhibetur, quam qui civibus terrenis: Nam gradu quidem honores isti differunt, sed utergue tamen ἐμοούσιος.*] And was it possible that you should think that this made for you? Because the world or Universe of Rationals are one Body or Society, and so *civil honour* is the same thing as such *in genere* to them in Heaven as to them on Earth: doth it follow that in this universal Society there are no *Kingdoms*, *Cities*, or *Families* specifically different? Nor no different *species* of the *civil honour*, what not to *Kings*, *Parents*, *Masters*? What a thing is *factious Interest*? *Vossius* only proveth *Generical Identity* of *civil honour*, and the specifical difference of it from the honour of *Religious Adoration*. The *Church universal* is one; and the *love* and *honour* which we owe to the *Saints* in Heaven and Earth is Generically of the same kind. But do you believe therefore that there are no subordinate *Species* of Churches and Honour on Earth? What not the Honour due to the *King*, the *Bishop*, the *Chancellor*, the *Parish Curates*, the *Deacons*, and the *Beggars*. Yet all this with you are Premises sufficient to conclude. [*And then it may be you may give leave to* —*Magis & minus non variant speciem*, to be a *Maxim* still] See what Evidence it is that must perswade us to *Nonconformity*. Are they not worthy to be silenced and branded as you have done, that can resist such *Light*? But you come

to

to the quick, and say, [*Is there no Communion but personal? Answ.* Yes, else they could not be *two ends* to make two *Societies*. You add, [*Many of the Kings Subjects never saw his face, yet they have many Hands and Eyes in respect of their subordinate Officers, so have Dioceſans in their Curates.*] *Answ.* Very true! And that proveth that a *Kingdom* is one *Society*, and a whole *Dioceſs* also one: *Ignoras Elenchum*. But doth that prove that there are no subordinate *Societies* in these? Which though subordinate in point of Power, yet specifically differ. Is there no such thing as *Personal Communion in presence*, because there is such a thing as *distant Communion of another sort?* For all that your terms of *Hands* and *Eyes* would hide it, I scarce think you are ignorant, that under the *King* there are *Heads* as well as *Hands* and *Eyes: Heads* of *Families*, *Schools*, *Colledges*, *Universities*, *Corporations*, *Cities*, who are *constitutive parts* of real Societies, which are not of the same *species* with a *Kingdom*, though in it. And if *Archbishops* be of God's appointment, so it should be with *Archbishops* and *Bishops*, and every Church should have a *Bishop*. But if you will not have it so, but we must only have a *Bishop* and *Curates*, and a *Dioceſan Church* and *Chappels*, you betray our Cause to the *Brownists*, who easily prove [*No Bishop or Pastor, no Church in* sensu politico:] And so when you have granted them that we have no *true Parish Churches*, there are few of them whose Wit is so weak as not to disprove the pretended right of such *Dioceſan Churches* as consist of the Carkasses of many hundred mortified *Parish Churches*.

§. 50. My

§. 50. My Answer I must not repeat, take it how you will: you here come to the very Controversie, I will not begin it with you, because I cannot prosecute it: I have so much to say on it, as at these rates may engage you and me in dispute for many years, if we lived so long: which I find no reason allowing me to undertake. Get me leave to *Write* and *Publish* it, and I will write you a just *Volume* of it, since it is published: till then I again tell you, I have said enough (though too negligently) in my Dispute of *Church Government*; (though one hath nibled at the Forms of some Arguments in it:) If you would have more, answer *Gers. Bucer*, *Parker*, and *Baine*, *Ames's fresh Suit*, to name no other.

§. 50. I shewed the invalidity, 1. Of your [*Licitis & honestis.*] 2. And of former Obedience, *sub pœna anathematis*, as nothing to our case in hand; and do you deny what I said, and disprove it. 2. I tell you, that so far as *Bishops* or *Chancellors* are the Kings Officers to Govern the Church *circa sacra* by the Sword, we will swear and perform Obedience to them under the *King*, in *licitis & honestis*. But I told you, they that take them for the *Usurpers* of *Spiritual power*, will easily prove it to be lawful to swear Obedience to Usurpers *in licitis & honestis*; will you deny that. 3. And I told you that it is another *Oath* that is *imposed* on us to take. But did you well to say, *You produced the words of Ignatius*, to prove the antiquity of *swearing* to *Bishops*, who saith not a syllable of any such thing? And untruly say, *I took no notice of it*, when I told you that *Ignatius* mentioned not *Oaths*, but only *actual Obedience*.

ence. This is *no notice* with you: But do you not know how late it was before *ſwearing Obedience* to *Biſhops* came into the Church, and by what ſort of men, and to what end and effect.

§. 52. Your talk of *Cartwright* confirmeth me of the vanity of the *Hypocrites reward*, the praiſe of men; there being nothing ſo falſe which may not by ſome men be ſaid of them with boldeſt confidence. If *Cochleus* or his like, do but ſay, That *Luther* learned of the *Devil*; that *Calvin* was a *ſtigmatized Sodomite*, *&c.* all their Followers can ever after ſay, *It is in Print.* So Mr. *S. P.* (ſome body) *Printed this* you ſay. And *Heylin* ſaith, *He promiſed.* What? juſt the ſame, or to the ſame ſenſe, as I told you, I voluntarily ſubſcribed, when I might (by the *Kings Declaration*) have choſen, meerly becauſe I would have them know our minds and peaceable reſolutions. I told you why he that can promiſe to live peaceably, *&c.* cannot *ſubſcribe* and *ſwear* the *Approbation* of all in that *Liturgy*, *Government*, *&c.* which he liveth peaceably under. But this is nothing to you; if *Cartwright* Conformed, firſt, Prove it by *credible Hiſtory*. 2. Why then could the great Earl of *Leiceſter* procure no more liberty for him, than an *Hoſpital* in *Warwick*, and no Church. 3. I have lived in *Coventry*, and been oft in *Warwick*, and know by all credible teſtimony of Neighbours, that it's falſe, and no ſuch thing as his Conformity was there dream'd of, any further than I Conform. 4. Why did he never declare it to the World, nor retract his Writings. 5. Your *Heylin*'s own words intimate the contrary; (though I muſt tell you, I owe as little belief

belief to that Book of his, as moſt Hiſtories written by *ſober Proteſtants.*) But you ſay much more, [Dr. *Burges*, *p.* 377. obſerved, *That* Cartwright *oppoſed the Ceremonies as Inconveniences, but not as unlawful, and therefore perſwaded men to Conform rather than leave their Flocks.*] *Anſw.* 1. But the Ceremonies are but part, and the leſſer part of Conformity. 2. Elſe had all Conformity been here included, he was *ſtill a Conformiſt*: And how could you then ſay, *That at laſt he wrangled himſelf into Conformity*, if he was ſuch at firſt? 3. But if you cite him truly, be judge your ſelf, whether *Heylin* ſaid true; and what will be your caſe if you will report all that you find ſuch men report. 1. Dr. *Burges*'s own words are but theſe, *pag.* 423. [*The conſideration of this neceſſity moved Mr.* Cartwright *to adviſe the wearing of the Surplice*; *and Mr.* Beza *to reſolve for the uſe of theſe Ceremonies, rather than the Flocks of Chriſt ſhould be forſaken for theſe.*] And he citeth *Cart. Repl.* 2. So that here is not a word of *Cartwright*'s Conceſſion in any thing but the *Surplice*, (kneeling he was for.) The *Anſwer* of *Ameſius* to his Father-in-law *Burges*, is in theſe words; (*Freſh ſuit*, *p.* 21, 22.) [Whereas he addeth, that *Beza* and Mr. *Cartwright* determined with them in caſe of the *Surplice*. I anſwer, 1. *They did not ſo for the Croſs.* 2. *They did not ſo for ſubſcription to either.* 3. *They did not ſo but by way of toleration, requiring alſo that men ſpeak againſt the impoſing of the Surplice.* 4. Beza *was not throughly acquainted with the ſtate of our Church.* Mr. *Cartwright*, as I have been certainly informed by his own Son, recalled that Paſſage of his Book, and

deſired

desired that his revoking of it might be made known.] Then followeth the Atteſtation of another to that report. Do you ſee now how credibly *S. P. Heylin* and you report *Cartwright* to have wrangled himſelf at laſt into Conformity: Be warned, and take up falſe reports no more.

§. 53. I thank you for ſhortning my trouble.

§. 54. [*Waſpiſh, and faltering, and raging, after a tedious journey.*] Are your *Logicks* above my skill to anſwer? But *adrem*, 1. It is a wonder to me that an *Engliſhman* ſhould be in doubt who they be that drive men from the Pariſh Churches? Enquire who drave away the People of *Kederminſter*? Did I? I *Preach'd*, I *Printed* long before. That ſhould the *Liturgy* be reſtored, it were no ſufficient cauſe, *&c.* When I was ſilenced and might not Preach in publick, the laſt Sermon that ever I preached to ſome at my Farwel in a private Houſe, was in concluſion to perſwade all to keep to the publick Churches, where the Miniſters are not *notoriouſly Inſufficient* as to the very *Eſſentials*, or *notorious Hereticks*, or *Malignant Oppoſers* (not of *differing Parties*, but) of the *certain Practice* of *Godlineſs* it ſelf. But when I had done my beſt then, and ſince by other means, the *Reading Vicar*, and one Sermon of the *Biſhops*, and one of the *Deans*, and many of a *Lecturers* after, and they ſaw ſo many hundred *Miniſters ſilenced*, it poſſeſſed them with ſo great a prejudice, that till a *good Miniſter* came among them, it was paſt my power to reconcile them to the Church; nor is it done ſo fully as before I could eaſily have done.

2. As to your ſecond *Queſtion*, When I told you

you how hardly the *People would be driven to Communion in your way:* You answered, *Had they not been distracted, distorted, poysoned by other Tutors.* —*But since they have been taught, like Wolves not to value the Scepter,* —*like Mastiff-dogs they will worry me to pieces. Those that are late perverted any way, are most heady and fierce. The Revolters are profound to make slaughter: And after the Scribes and Pharisees compassed Sea and Land to make a Proselyte, when he was made, he was twofold more the Child of Hell than themselves.* These are your words: And I thought I had used them very gently, when I only say, [*Whether all such Dissenters are such Children of Hell as you describe.*] (I might have added, *such Wolves, Dogs, &c.*) I shall leave to a *more wise and righteous Judge*, what is in these words! Be impartial one hour before you die, and compare them with your own, and think how he that will say at last, [*Inasmuch as you did it not to one of the least of these my Brethren, &c.*] will take all these Revilings of faithful Souls. But how heedlesly do you read? I said, [*All such Dissenters as you described, and were talkt of.*] And you say, [*all Dissenters.*] There is no end at this rate of calling you again to *read* what you *write against.* I excuse no mans faults: But I will not be one of those Nurses that will cast the Children out of the house when ever they cry or wrangle, till I find it pleaseth our Father, and till I know where to have better enow in their rooms: Nor will I call them *Wolves and Dogs*, that for fear of sinning against God dare not do as I do, and too precisely wrangle with me when I urge them to

it:

it: And if their narrow throats cannot ſwallow ſo big Morſels as the Nurſe can, but will cry and ſtrive when it is cram'd down by force, I will not cut their Throats to widen the paſſage; nor ſtretch Conſcience, till like a crakt Bladder it will hold nothing: Nor with *Ithacius*, get the worſt on my ſide as my Flocke, and bring the ſtricteſt under ſuſpicion and reproach, becauſe they are angry with me. And what now your *Calumniare fortiter* ſignifieth, Review.

§. 55. The matter of this I have anſwered. The Flowers of [*Flood-gates Torrents, Dragons Scum, Raca, &c.* I leave unanſwered, becauſe you would have brevity: But if you would have brevity, you ſhould not make work for prolixity, unleſs you beſpeak me to forbear anſwering you. But I know not how better to ſpare your trouble and my own, than to tell you, that I expect or deſire no anſwer from you to all this that I have written; And if you do ſend me one, I will not promiſe you a Reply. I like the Work as little as you do: And for the matter and manner of my Writings, I do (as one that daily expecteth, (and long have done) *a ſpeedy paſſage into a more holy, wiſe, righteous, and peaceable World*) Proteſt to you, that as I have not been for forty years at leaſt the moſt negligent *Searcher* after *Truth*, nor the *coldeſt Deſirer* of it; but have I think Impartially laboured to know it, without adhering to any *Sect*, (at leaſt theſe 25 years;) ſo I do defend nothing which I am perſwaded *is the Truth*; nor oppoſe any other mens ways, but what I think my *Fidelity* to *God*, his *Church*, and *Truth* obligeth me to oppoſe. If you be in the

right and I in the *wrong*, it is becauſe you have a more *bleſſed underſtanding*, and not becauſe I have been leſs *ſtudious*, or *deſirous* to know the truth than you. And I confeſs my *Temper* and *Style* is ſharp; and *Verba rebus aptanda*, is a *Motto* that *Quoad diſpoſitionem* was born with me, and maketh me oft forbear that pleaſing ſtyle, which ſhould be fitted to the perſons, though unſuitable to the thing. But I write in haſt, and ſuit all my Anſwers juſt to the matter before me, not conſidering ſufficiently how men can bear it. I juſtifie none of this; and I unfeignedly deſire you to pardon all Paſſages, which you ſhall truly find to tranſgreſs the Rules of *Chriſtian lenity*: For if I be *angry* I would not *ſin*; but I am not conſcious of wrath or diſaffection when I ſpeak moſt eagerly. But I muſt needs tell you that had this writing been for the view of the World, I would have forborne moſt of that freedom which in plainer I have uſed to you, but being only for your ſelf I remembred *Lev.* 19. 17. which I need not recite: being confident that you have much wronged your bretheren by the Book which you have written. Which I impute (with all the reſt of our diviſions, violences and calamities) to want of acquaintance and familiarity with each other; each party converſing familiarly only with those of their own mind, and judging falſly of their neereſt Neighbours as of real ſtrangers, by the reports of factious men. For I do not remember that I ever yet had reall acquaintance with any man in my Life, that I did not live in *Love* and *Peace* with. But all my *reproaches*, *accuſations*, and *ſufferings*, have come from men that know me

not

not (unleſs by a few publick interviews.) And I do faithfully endeavour to defend behind their backs, the juſt *Honour* and *Reputation* of the *Biſhops* and *Conformiſts*, as well as of the *Nonconformiſts*, being not for factious Calumny againſt either. Nor am ſo ſharp in my cenſures, as your moderate *Eraſmus* was againſt ſuch Biſhops as he then of *London*, that would have perſecuted Dr. *Colet*, (the Biſhop being a learned *Scotiſt*,) who, as Mr. *Thomas Smith* tranſlateth him in the Life of Dr. *Colet*, ſaith, [*of which ſort of men I have known ſome that I WOULD NOT CALL KNAVES, but I never knew one, whom I COULD CALL a CHRISTIAN.* There be ſome that judge juſt thus of the (not unwilling *Conformiſts*, but) the eager promoters and defenders of it among the *Clergy*, (that are not our ſuperiours.) But ſo do not I, but reprove their cenſoriousneſs; though I muſt needs confeſs, while I fear being of a party, I fear not being one that differeth from ungodly formal Hypocrites, and that I find very great difference in point of ſerious piety between parties. And if in my Youth I did incline more to one party than another, it was only on the ſuppoſition that they were more ſpiritual, practical, and devoted to God, (on which account I hope I ſhall ſtill value them) though even then *Schiſm* was, and now much more is, a thing which I abhorr; but take not thoſe to be the leaſt promoters of it, who moſt accuſe their brethren of it, being juſt of *Hales*'s mind in that treat of *Schiſm*. And for former complyances, &c. (you were acquainted at *Coſſold*, Sir *Robert Pyes*, Mr. *Twiſſe*'s, &c.) conſider

whether of us it is that needeth no Retractation: A word to the wise is enough. Having some information of your former life, I may very easily say, that as great a noise as you now make for Conformity, and against the late Usurpers, I did much more against them than you did in my Ministry; and my danger from them was not a denial of a richer living (which I never sought) but for open opposing their usurpation, engagement-daies of thanksgiving for unjust victories, &c. I add this but to mind you that some men by reproaching others, do doubly reproach themselves, and that consciousness of their proper case should make men speak as they would hear.

'Ἐνατένισον εἰς τὰς γραφὰς, &c. look diligently into 'the Scriptures which are the true Oracles of the 'Holy Ghost: learn that in them is contained no-'thing unjust, or fained, or counterfeit. For you 'shall not find that the just were rejected by holy 'men. The just suffered persecution, but from 'the ungodly. They were cast into prison, but by 'the Profane; they were stoned, but by the un-'righteous and transgressours of the Laws: They 'were extinct, but by the wicked and such as 'were pricked with unjust envy against them. *Clemens. Roman.* ad *Corinth.*

Reader, *remember that this was written only for Mr.* Hinkleys *sight, if he had so pleased.*

FINIS.

RICHARD BAXTERS *second Account to Mr.* John Cheney *of his Judgment, accuſed by him of Atheiſm, ſubverting all Religion, Chriſtianity, the Goſpel, the Church, all Government, Introducing Popery,* &c. *Eſpecially for aſſerting,* 1. *That Chriſt hath Inſtituted one Univerſal Church, of which he onely is the Head, and particular Churches as parts of it, of which the Paſtors are Subordinate Heads or Governours, and ſo formally differenced.* 2. *That neither of them is Conſtituted without ſome ſignification of conſent: which he never before heard one Chriſtian deny.*

CHAP. I.

PREFATORY.

§ 1. *CONtending* though Defenſive, and made neceſſary by Accuſers, is an unpleaſant work: As I would chooſe a Priſon before a Defenſive War, were it for no greater intereſt than my own; ſo I would chooſe to

be in Print proclaimed an Heretick, Schismatick, Atheist, or any thing, rather than be at the unpleasing labour of a Confutation of all Accusers, were it not for a higher interest than mine: For though we *must contend for the Faith*, yet the *servant of the Lord must not needlesly strive*, 2 Tim. 2. 24, 25. And experience tells us, the good seldome answereth the bad effects.

§ 2. And there are few that call me to a publick Account, that I answer less willingly than Mr. *Cheney*: because his Accusations are such gross Mistakes, that I cannot Answer them in the gentlest manner, according to truth, without opening that which will bring him lower in the Readers esteem than I desire; and I much fear, will be to himself a temptation which he will hardly overcome, as I see by this his 2d Book. Had he that was my familiar Neighbour thought meet to have spoken with me, before his Publications, I am past doubt that I could have convinced him of multitudes of Untruths and Errours, so as to have prevented such a publication of them; for in private he would easilier have born the detection of them, than in the hearing of the World, (which he has chosen.) But whereas some cast away his Book, as a fardel of Dotage and shameless Lyes, I must remember such, that I am confident he wrote no falshoods with a purpose knowingly to deceive; and therefore they are not strictly Lyes, but as *rash untruths* are such in a larger sense, which *ignorant men* assert for want of due tryal. It is a great errour to overvalue such poor frail ignorant men as we all are: Mr. *Ch.* and I have both over-valued one another;

and

and this errour now we have both eſcaped, but not laid by our Chriſtian love. And as God will not take Mens Diſeaſes for their Sins, his bodily temper is to me a great excuſe of his *ſtrong confident miſtakes*.

§ 3. The very Introductory Preface of his Books diſowning Cruelty and uncharitable dividing Impoſitions, enableth me to forgive him the multitude of raſh untruths and ſlanders: and inſtead of a *Mentiris*, I ſhall put but a *Putares* or *Non-putares*.

I have juſt ſuch a task in dealing with Mr.*Ch.* as with one that is hard of hearing: when I ſpeak to ſuch a one, that heareth but one half, and miſ-heareth the reſt, he anſwereth me as he heard: and when I tell him his miſtake, his laſt reply is, [*I thought you had ſaid thus and thus:*] but if I ſhould diſpute a whole day with ſuch a man, I ſhould be ſharply cenſured if I printed the Diſpute, and told the World how *many hundred times* the man miſ-heard, and ſo miſtook me. And I fear neither he himſelf, nor the Reader that valueth his time, would thank me for ſuch exerciſe of my Arithmetick with Mr.*Cheney*.

§ 4. For his Preface I thank him: It tells me, that all our Accuſers do it not in meer Malignity: and that he hath a few ſteps further to tumble, before he come to the bottom of the hill. His Book conſiſteth partly of a handſome conſiderable diſcourſe for Prelacie, and other Church-Offices of Humane Invention; and partly of a new & ſingular Doctrine about Church-Forms; & partly in a critical diſcharge of his fancy, and unpacking his preparations againſt the Independant Co-

venant, and Church-Form; and partly in detecting my many Atheistical, Infidel, Impious Errours, by which he supposeth I am deceiving the world; and partly in a multitude of falshoods of me (and others) in matter of fact; and partly (I hope an ignorant) plea for the Pope. To open all these fully, would tire the Reader and me.

CHAP. II.

What the Doctrine is which he accuseth of Atheism, Impiety, &c.

§ 1. THE Reader that hath well perused my Writings knoweth it: but I cannot expect that all should do so that read his Book. The abstract is this.

I. That Jesus Christ is Head over all things to the Church, *Eph.* 1. 22, 23.

II. That the Mosaical Law, as such, never bound other Kingdoms, and is ceased, with their Commonwealth, and is abrogated by Christ, and that he as King of the Church, hath established a sufficient Law for all that is universally necessary for Doctrine, Worship, and Church-order or Government: and was faithful in all his house as *Moses*, and Commissioned his Apostles to Disciple Nations, Baptizing them and teaching them what Christ himself had commanded them, *Matth.* 28. 19.

III. That he setled the Ministry and Church-Form before he made any Magistrate Christian, and

and that no Magistrate hath power to change them.

IV. That what his Apostles did by his Commission and Spirit, he did by them.

V. That Church-Forms being so Instituted and Constituted, he hath not left them so much to the will of Man, as he hath done the Forms of Civil Government.

VI. That Christ hath *One Universal Church*, of which he is the onely Head and Law-giver, and no Vicar personal or collective, as *one Political person* or power: of which professed believers and consenters in Baptism are the visible Members, and sincere Believers and Consenters the Spiritual saved Members.

VII. That the *World* and *Church* are not all one; nor Heathens and Infidels the same with Christians, nor any parts of the Church properly called.

VIII. That Christs Ministers first work to which they were Commissioned, was not on the Church or any Member of it, but the Infidel world to gather them into a Church; and the first Baptized person was not Baptized into a pre-existent Church; but the Church existing, Baptism entereth men into it.

IX. That the first Baptizer was no Pastor of such an existent Church, but an Organical Minister to gather a Christian Church.

X. That though at Baptism one may enter into the Universal and a particular Church, yet Baptisme *qua talis* entereth us onely into the Universal, being our Christening or Covenant-uniting to the body of Christ.

XI. That a Paſtor in the Scripture and uſual ſenſe, is a Relate to *Oves* the Sheep or Flock, and not to Infidels: And a Miniſtry to Infidels, and an Epiſcopacy or Paſtorſhip of the flock, are different notions: but if any will uſe the terms otherwiſe, we contend not *de nomine*, though you call him a Paſtor of Infidels, or what elſe you can deviſe.

XII. To explain my ſelf, when I mention a Biſhop or Paſtor, I mean the Biſhop or Paſtor of a Church: and I take not Heathens for the Church.

XIII. I believe that in this Univerſal Church are thouſands of particular Churches, and this by Chriſts Inſtitution.

XIV. I believe that there is no particular Church or Chriſtian on earth, who is not (reſpectively as Viſible or Myſtical) a part of the Univerſal Church.

XV. As every worſhipping Aſſembly is a Church in a larger ſenſe, ſo a Church in a political ſenſe is eſſentially conſtituted of the Paſtor and People, or the Sacerdotal guiding and the guided parts: and of ſuch a Church it is that I am ſpeaking.

XVI. As ſuch meeting *in tranſitu* are an *Extemporate tranſient Church*, ſo fixed *Cohabitants* ought to be a Church accordingly fixed, related to each others as ſuch for longer than the preſent meeting.

XVII. Every ſuch Political fixed Church, ſhould conſiſt of a Paſtor (at leaſt) accordingly fixed, to a cohabiting people, and as *their Paſtor* more ſpecially related by obligation and authority

ty to them, than to ſtrangers or neighbour Churches. He is not bound to do that for all, as he is for them, nor may go into other Paſtors Churches with equal power, nor officiate where he pleaſe.

XVIII. If there be no Church but the Univerſal, than there is neither Parochial, Dioceſan, or National, nor are Aſſemblies Churches. Nor is our King the Royal Governour of any Church: for of the Univerſal he is not.

XIX. Chriſtian Princes muſt do their beſt to ſettle faithful Paſtors in all Churches, that is, according to the Laws of Chriſt, but not againſt them. But as they muſt do their beſt that all their Subjects may have good Phyciſians, Schoolmaſters, Wives, or Husbands, Servants, Dyet, Cloathing, &c. but yet are not truſted by office to chooſe all theſe for every one, and impoſe them on Diſſenters, becauſe the ſame God that made *Kingly power*, did *firſt make perſonal and paternal power*, which Kings cannot diſſolve: ſo every man is ſo nearly concerned for his own Salvation, more than for Wife, Servant, Dyet, Phyciſian, &c. that though he muſt thankfully accept of all the Rulers lawful help, he is ſtill the moſt obliged chooſer. Nor is it any part of the office of a King, to chooſe and impoſe on every Subject a Guide or Paſtor, to whom only he ſhall truſt the Paſtoral conduct of his Soul, any more than a Phyſician or a Tutor for him.

XX. Pariſh-bounds are not of Primitive or Divine Inſtitution: but cohabitation or propinquity is a needful qualification of ſetled Members, *gratia finis*: And Pariſh-bounds are a uſeful hu-

mane determination, according to the general Rules, *Do all to edification and in order.*

XXI. No one is a Church-member merely becauſe he dwelleth in the Pariſh; for unbaptized Infidels, Heathens, Atheiſts, may dwell there.

XXII. Nor is a ſtranger a Church-member for coming into the Aſſembly; for ſuch, as aforeſaid, or Jews, Mahometans, may come in.

XXIII. A Paſtor oweth more care and duty to his flock, than to the reſt of the world (as a Phyſician to his Hoſpital.) Therefore he muſt know who they are, better than by knowing that they dwell in the Pariſh; nor may he Baptize them, or give them the Lords Supper, only becauſe he ſeeth them in the Aſſembly or in the Pariſh: elſe Jews and Heathens muſt have it.

XXIV. Nor is he to give it to every one that demandeth it: for ſo may Jews and Heathens, that take it in ſcorn, or for by-ends.

XXV. Yet a Chriſtian having a valid Certificate that he is ſuch, hath right to tranſient Communion with any Church of Chriſt where he cometh: but for order, the antient Churches uſed not to receive them without ſome Certificates from the Churches that they came from, leſt Hereticks and Excommunicates, unknown perſons, ſhould be every where received.

XXVI. No man can be an (adult) Chriſtian without ſignified conſent: nor a ſtated member of any particular Church, without ſuch conſent: no, nor a lawful tranſient Communicant without conſent. For ſo great benefits none but conſenters have right to, nor can ſuch relations be otherwiſe contracted.

XXVII. Consent not signified nor known, is none to the Church.

XXVIII. A man may be obliged to consent that doth not: but that makes no man a Christian or member of the Universal Church; else Millions of Infidels and Heathens are Christians; And so it maketh no one a member of a particular Church, that he is *obliged* to be one: nor am I a Pastor over any men as a Church, because they are obliged to take me for their Pastor, no more than that is a Husband, Wife, Servant, who is obliged to be so, and will not. To say that I am a Pastor to Heathens as a Church, is a contradiction; or that I am their Pastor as my special Christian flock, and particular Church-members that consent not.

XXIX. But the same man that liveth among such, may be to consenting Christians a Pastor; and to Refusers, Infidels, or Heathens, a Teacher. The Church ever distinguished the *Audientes* and *Catechumene Candidates*, from the *Fideles*, who were the Members of the Church.

XXX. No Pastor or people should impose any Covenant on any adult to be Christened, but consent to be Christians signified by Baptism; nor on any in order to transient Communion among strangers, but just notice of their Christianity and understanding consent to that Communion: nor on any in order to their being the stated Members of this or that flock and particular Church, but due notice of their Christianity, and of their understanding consent to what is essential to such members; that is, to the relation as essentiated by the correlate and ends.

XXXI. No one ſhould be obliged by covenant to continue one year or Month in the ſtation of that particular relation: becauſe they know not when Gods providence may oblige them to remove or change it.

XXXII. Though the Peoples conſent be neceſſary to their relation, their *Election* of the Paſtor (which ſignifieth the firſt determination who ſhall be the man) is not abſolutely neceſſary, though of old ſo thought. An *after-Conſent* may ſerve *ad eſſe relationis*.

XXXIII. Much leſs is it neceſſary that the people chooſe who ſhall be ordained a Miniſter unfixed, and only of the Univerſal Church.

XXXIV. 1. Mutual conſent of the duely qualified Ordained and Ordainer, determineth who ſhall be a Miniſter in the Church Univerſal; as conſent of the Colledge and the Candidate do who ſhall be the Licenſed Phyſician. 2. The Peoples conſent and the Miniſters inſtituted, determine who ſhall be the Paſtor of this particular Flock or Church. 3. The King determineth whom he will tolerate, countenance and maintain.

XXXV. Though a man may be Ordained but once to the Miniſtry unfixed in the Univerſal Church, (to which I ſaid the Peoples conſent is not neceſſary) yet may he be oft removed from one particular Church to another, on juſt cauſe, to which the peoples conſent (if not Election) is ſtill neceſſary. Though to avoid Ambition, the old Canons forbad Biſhops to remove.

XXXVI. It's lawful to be ordained *ſine titulo* only to the Miniſtry in general; but in ſettled Churches

Churches it is usually inconvenient: And he that is ordained to a fixed Church, doth at once become a Minister in the universal Church (and may act as a Minister, and not as a Layman, when called elsewhere) and also a fixed Minister of a particular Church; even as he that is baptized into a particular Church, is a member of both: Though Baptism and Ordination *qua tales* enter but into the Universal.

XXXVII. It is not this or that mode of signification of consent that is necessary to either relation of Pastor or Flock; but *Consent signified intelligibly:* where Laws and Custome order it that actual ordinary attendance in publick worship and communion, and submission to necessary ministration, shall be the signification, all that so do express consent by it. And therefore our ordinary Parish-Assembling and Communion, being express consent to the mutual relation, have that which is necessary *ad esse* to true Churches; and they slander them that say, they are not such. But *ad melius esse* more may oft-times be profitable; 1. Because that is the best means, which is best fitted to the end: But the end of *Signes* being *Notification*, that is, *cæteris paribus*, the best which is most notifying; as that is the best Language which is most significant and intelligible. Why should playing in the dark, or dealing underboard be preferred in the greatest things? 2. It oft falls out, that some that live in the Parish are known Church-Papists, Church-Atheists & Infidels, & will tell in their meetings to their companions, [*I believe not the words of the Parish-Priest: It is his Trade to talk for gain: I will do what the Law requires*

requires of me, for my safety; but I will have no more to do with him, nor do I take him for a true Pastor, that hath any Authority but by Law, nor for any Pastor to me.] And 3. there are many Hereticks and Schismaticks, engaged Members of other Churches; who yet to avoid suffering, will do that in the Parish-Church, which the Law requireth. 4. And the Antient Churches used, expres's Consent, yea and Election. So for the Minister; he is no Pastor without his signified consent: but actual Ministration may be such a signification. This is enough to reconcile the difference about Church-covenants.

XXXVIII. They that rail against a more expres's consent in cases truly dubious, as if it were tyranny and destructive to Christianity, do suppose that if the King and Law commanded such a thing, they commanded Tyrannically that which destroyeth Christianity; and contradict themselves when they say that Rulers may make various orders of Church-governours, and determine of undetermined Modes.

XXXIX. As it is not needful and usual to set up a *Coordinate Imperium artificum vel Philosophorum in Imperio Civili*; so it seemeth also of an *Imperium Religiosum*. The first Question is, whether Christ hath Instituted such: The second, whether he hath given power to Men to make it. There is not in any Kingdom that I hear of, (but somewhat towards it in *China*) such a Society of Physicians, Astronomers, Navigators, Lawyers, Schoolmasters, Philosophers, &c. who set up a Coordinate Empire or Government, that shall have all degrees of self-governing power as a National So-

Socity, with one Supreme, either Monarchical, Aristocratical, or Democratical Head, according to the order of Civil-government: Nor doth any reproach Schools, Colledges, Hospitals, or any trading Societies, that they are confused, Independent, and ungoverned, because they have no common Governour but God and the King, nor any particular Governour, but the Principal, or Master and Fellows of the Society; nor any National association, besides their subjection to one King, and their voluntary correspondence for concord and mutual assistance with one another. And much less is there any Co-ordinate, Political Regiment of any of these through all the world, under one visible humane Head, personal or collective. And yet many think that there is such a Society and Regiment for Religion; National say some, Universal say others: That all that will serve God and be saved, must be under one Co-ordinate power over all the Kingdom, or World, besides Christ and the Supreme Magistrate: and they contend whether this power be Monarchical or Aristocratical, &c. I am so far Independent, as to think that Christ hath Instituted no such Universal or National Power and Head of Religion: but that 1. his own Universal Kingdom: 2. And particular Churches under their several Bishops and Teachers: 3. And Synods for concord and mutual help: 4. And Christian Magistrates to rule all by the Sword: 5. With the improvement of Mens eminent gifts and opportunities, that these be Instituted by Christ I doubt not: 6. And whether some should succeed the Apostles (excepting their extraordinary powers) in having a visiting, instructing,

or-

ordering care of many Churches and their Bishops and Teachers, I confess my self uncertain; and therefore will never strive against such, nor deny due obedience to them, who shew a true call to such an employment. Nay, if Christ have made no such Institution; yet 1. if the Christian Magistrate, 2. or the Churches by consent, choose some faithful Ministers to such a power, onely to direct, instruct, guide, admonish, reprove, exhort the Bishops and Teachers of the particular Churches, without any other force than the Apostles used, and not destroying any of their proper power and duty, or that Church-order which the Apostles setled; I am no opposer of any such, though my uncertainty disables me from subscribing and swearing to the right of their Authority. The *Scots* themselves, even by *Knox*'s consent, set up Super-intendents over many Churches (*John Spotswood* Super-intendent of *Lothian*, and so others.) And the power of a President, Principal or Rector of a Colledge of Physicians, Philosophers, or Divines, doth not make him of any other Order or species of Office and Profession than the rest. But if any affirm more than this, I will *learn*, but cannot yet swear or subscribe it.

XL. Those that are for the obligation of the *Jewish* order, I have fully spoke to in my first *Plea for Peace*. Those that are only for the power of man to make such several Orders or Ranks of Governours in the Church, as are in Armies, and Kingdoms, 1. Must tell us what sort of power may be given them: 2. And who must give it. And 1. No men can Institute a power of the *same spe-*

cies,

cies, or *another ſpecies* from that which we call the *Sacred Miniſtry*, or as the Fathers, the *Sacerdotal*, but what is *ſubordinate* about the *Accidentals* of Religion and the Church. 1. Not the *ſame ſpecies*, becauſe it is Inſtituted by God already: No Man can create a creature already created. 2. Not of *another ſupra-ordinate* or *co-ordinate*: for 1. they can prove no power given them to do it: 2. And that were to accuſe Chriſt of inſufficient doing his undertaken work, and being leſs faithful in his houſe than *Moſes*: 3. And it will infer Mans introduction of a new co-ordinate Doctrine, Worſhip, or Religious Miniſtration: for the Miniſtration of the *word and Sacraments*, and *Keys*, is already appointed by Chriſt: And the Office or *Order* is ſpecified by the work and *terminus*; and a new Office hath new work. But in the ſame *ſpecies* of Religious Miniſtration, there are abundance of accidentals and circumſtances; and *Princes* or *conſenting* Churches may give men power *in thoſe* accordingly. But not to forbid what Chriſt commanded, nor deſtroy the works and power of his Inſtitution. And if they that are for other *ſuperiour or co-ordinate ſpecies* of Church-power, beſides what is afore-granted, ſay that *it is a lawful humane Ordinance*: 1. Thoſe that ſay, *Princes* only may make it, confeſs the Church had none that was lawful for three hundred years. And they muſt prove the Commiſſion. 2. Thoſe that ſay the *Inferiour Biſhops* made it by conſent; 1. feign Inferiours to have power to make a power above their own, (which is more than for Presbyters to ordain their like.) 2. Why may not Archbiſhops then make Patriarks, and

they

they a Pope, *ad summum ascendendo?* 3. They must prove their power; and that they are so far equal to Apostles, (who yet were but to teach the Nations what Christ commanded them; which these Men know not but by the Scripture.) 4. What Man maketh, Man may unmake. And how came we to be less free than our Ancestors that made such Offices?

XLI. In my Book of Concord where this is granted, yet I say, that let Church-Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Primates, Archbishops, or Diocesans, like ours that have no Bishops under them, be never so probably maintained to be lawful, yea, and desirable; yet the uniting in them by consent and approbation, will never become the terms or way of Universal Concord, which I have fully proved; even all that is true and good, will never be the terms of Universal Concord, nor just Christian Communion; much less that which hath so much matter of doubt, and great suspition of evil. But I will live in Christian love, peace, and submission my self, on terms uncapable of common concord, or my own approbation of the things as imposed or done by all others.

XLII. Lay-Chancellours may do what belongeth to a Magistrate, but not use the Church-Keyes, nor be the Church-Judges of Mens Communion, because Christ hath Instituted the Sacred Office for it.

XLIII. A Church is *Ens Politicum* (in the sense in hand) and the form of it is Relative, in the predicament of Relation.

XLIV. The parts of the Universal Church are similar and dissimilar, more simple or more com-

compound. And the word [*whole*] applyed to a part, disproveth not its being a part of the whole Christian world or Church. A whole hand, foot, head, &c. is part of a whole Body; and a whole Body part of a whole Man, and a whole Man part of a whole Family, and a whole Family part of a whole street, and that of a whole City, and that of a whole County or Kingdom: A whole College of a whole University, &c. All Members save Souls and Atomes, are compounds.

XLV. When we call all the Christian world [*The Catholick Church*] and call *e.g. Hippo* [*A or the Catholick Church*] the word [*Catholick*] and [*The*] are not *univocal*: In the later we mean only [*The Church at* Hippo] which holds the true Catholick Faith, and is a true part of the Catholick Church in the first sense. *Penuria nominum necessaria reddit æquivoca.*

XLVI. Particular Churches are Visible in the Regent and Governed parts: The Universal Church is Visible in the Governed part, and in the Head only, so far as he was once on Earth, and is now visible in Heaven (his Court) and will be visible at last to all, and ruleth by visible Laws; but not as a Head now visible on Earth: nor is this any deformity to his Church, nor any reason why it may not be called Visible; as I have fully proved in two Books against *W. Johnson*, alias *Terret.*

XLVII. Those that deny an Universal Visible Church, differ only *de nomine*, not *de re*: They only deny any Universal Regent power, Monarchical, or Aristocratical, or Democratical, under Christ; but I know no Christian that ever denyed the fore-described.

XLVIII. *Forma dat esse :* Divers constitutive forms, or specifying differences, make divers Essences. Therefore the form of a Troop being the Captains Government, differs from the form of a Regiment, which is the Colonels Governing Relation, and both from the forms of the Army, which is the Generals. The formal Essence of a Colledge, is divers from that of an University; and of a Family from a Corporation, or City; and that from a Kingdom. And as *forma dat nomen*, they have divers names: A Family *qua talis*, is not a Kingdom, *&c.* Reader, forgive the mention of these things, which Children know, and till now I never read or heard any man deny or question. In that which followeth, you shall see the Reasons that excuse me.

CHAP. III.

What Mr. Cheyney *saith against these things: And* 1. *Of Church-Forms and Essence.*

§ 1. THough it tempt me not to Conformity as the way of Concord, where I see the great difference of such as plead for it amongst themselves, yet I must do that right to the Conformists, as to tell the world that they must not be judged of by Mr. *Ch*'s opinions; and that I know no other Conformist (or Non-conformist) of his mind about Church-Forms.

§ 2. But I must add, that his Case doth increase

creaſe my Conviction againſt himſelf and them, that their Conformity is ſo far from being the neceſſary Cement, that it is utterly deſtructive of it, as ſo impoſed: and that it muſt be on few plain neceſſary things, that common concord muſt be held, or we muſt have none. Mr. *Ch.* thinks me one who may be endured in the Miniſtry, and I think ſo by him; and yet how far eaſier and plainer than our Controverſies of Conformity, are thoſe things in which we differ to the height of his following Accuſations? If none ſhould be endured that cannot Covenant, Swear, Subſcribe, Declare and Practice, as is required, how much leſs can ſuch as he and I be endured in one Church, if we differ as he ſaith we do? O what pardon and forbearance doth our peace require!

§ 3. Of Church-Forms and Eſſence, hear ſome of his Judgment.

Pag. 3. [The ſeveral Congregations and Aſſemblies of Paſtors and People *throughout the Kingdom, are not limbs and parcels of a Church, but they are ſo many Churches — conſiſting of a Paſtor Governing, and people governed, joyning together in publick worſhip — It is called* [the Church of *England*] *as all the Chriſtian Paſtors and people throughout the world, are called the Univerſal Church — One Church, of which Chriſt is the tranſcendent Head — I do not ſee but it is proper to call all the Chriſtian Paſtors and people of* England — *One Church.* — P. 6. *Chriſt is the Head of the Church of* England, — *and under Chriſt all the Pariſh-Miniſters are ſubordinate Guides and Rulers of their Flocks reſpectively.* — P. 7. *Some are as Colonels of Regiments, others as Captains of Troops; the Body*

is but One, the Members many.---P.13. *The New Testament saith,*---*The Churches of* Galatia, Gal. 1. 2. *the Churches of* Judea, Asia,---*Yet One body.*---*All the faithful make One heavenly City,*---*one Church of the first born;*---*so that Gods Church on Earth is Many Churches, and yet but One Church.*---(*Do you not think now that we are agreed? But hear him judge himself.*) P.15. *I will shew one common Errour or mistake in multitudes of our able Divines,*---*That those we call particular Churches, are counted Parts and Members of the Church Universal. This I deny,* ---Mr. Baxter *makes the Church of* England, *or the Churches of* England, *to be an integral part of the Church Universal,*---*as a Troop of an Army, or a City of a Kingdom. So the Independents. I overthrow this Errour by this Argument. One and the same thing cannot be both a Body and a Member, a whole and a part, a society and one single person.*---*But that which we call a single or particular Church, is not a Member but a Body; it is not a limb or part of a Church, but a whole and entire Church,*---*It hath a whole within it.*---London *is not a Member of* England, *but a City and aggregation of Members. It's no less than a flat contradiction in terms,* ---*what Dr.* Ames *saith,* Medul. l. 1. c. 32. *that a particular Church* est Membrum ex aggregatione variorum Membrorum singulorum compositum, *contrary to common reason and plain Scripture.*---P.18. *A bare Member in the Body hath no Authority, but acteth by mere natural life and appetite, and is not endued with rational authority. nor can be capable of any.*---*That which we call a single Church, is a Catholick or Universal Church. It hath an Universal Head. To be a Christian is to be*

of

of an universal impartial spirit;----where there is an All, there is an Universal.----But every single Church hath an All within it, the Pastor and all his flock.---- The Church Universal and particular, do only differ as to place and number;----A Church of godly Ministers and people in France, Holland,----*and* England, *differ but as to place.----Every Church (of Christians) must needs be a Church Universal; not a limb or member of another Church, but a true body, or entire Christian society.*----P. 20. *Christs Body is One: not as one is opposed to Multitude----but to division, contrariety, and destruction.*

§ 4. P. 21. *This leads me to shew the unsoundness of another part of* Mr. Baxters *Doctrine, and some others with him: He saith,* [*There are two essentially different Policies or Forms of Church-Government of Christs Institution, never to be altered by man: 1. The Form of the Universal Church as Headed by Christ himself, which all Christians own as they are Christians, in their Baptism. 2. Particular Churches headed by their particular Bishops or Pastors, and are parts of the Universal, as a Troop of an Army, or a City of a Kingdom.----And he defines the Universal Church to be,* The universality of Baptized Christians, headed by Christ himself. *These his sayings contain many Errours; I will first note them out, and then confute and prove them to be Errours. 1. It is an Errour in the art of defining, to put in those words,* [Headed by Christ himself.] 2. *It is another Errour to define the Universal Church without Guides and Ministers, as one essential constituent part.* 3. *It is another Errour to say, that the Universal Church, and Churches particular, differ essentially.* 1. *It is an Errour in the art of defining to*

ſay,---Headed by Chriſt himſelf] *that's ſuppoſed, but need not be in the definition. He finds fault himſelf with ſuch a defect in the definition of a particular Church. Grant them to be Chriſtians, and you grant they own Chriſt.---2. It is an Errour to define the Univerſal Church without Paſtors,---So doth the Aſſemblies Confeſſion, and Mr.*Hudſon*---His definition of the Church without Paſtors, is, as if he defined a living healthful man, without a ſtomach, liver or lungs.---*P. 24. *3. If there be an eſſential difference between Church and Church, what then is the difference between the Church and the World! Heaven and Hell! the righteous and the wicked!---How can any man know which is the right Church? We ſhall never be able to confute Popery nor Infidelity by this Doctrine: For this Doctrine ſuppoſeth two eſſentially different Churches: The Univerſal Church without Paſtors, and of this Chriſt is Head himſelf: Particular Churches, of which Chriſt is no Head, but particular Paſtors are the Heads.---By this Doctrine the ſame thing ſhall be contrary to it ſelf.---Chriſts Church in this world is but one! And can one and the ſame thing have two different Eſſences, beings, and definitions?* Quæ conveniunt uno tertio, &c. *But the Church Univerſal and particular agree* in uno tertio. *They ſtand on one foundation, are directed by one rule, quickned by one ſpirit; an addition of homogeneous Particles makes no eſſential difference. It will neceſſarily infer, that God is contrary to himſelf, and that the eſſentiating principles of Church holineſs, order and government, are black and white, darkneſs and light,---*P. 25. *If this opinion ſtand, Religion cannot ſtand. Two eſſentially different Forms of*

Churches,

Churches, will infer two ſorts of Holineſs, the one repugnant to the other, (yet) ſubordinata non pugnant. *If Chriſt ſet up two repugnant, or eſſentially different Church-Forms, he is not the Saviour, but the deceiver of the world. (O dreadful!)*

§ 5. P. 92. *A word more* ad hominem *of that opinion, That particular Churches are parts of the Univerſal, as a Troop is of an Army, or a City of a Kingdom.*

This is Mr. Baxters *opinion: why then do you blame the turning all the Pariſh-Churches into Chappels, and making them to be but parts of the Dioceſan, as a Troop is of an Army,* &c. *who ſees not that your Doctrine doth the ſame that you condemn,* &c. *If they are but parts and Members of another Church, (the Univerſal) then they are not Churches. ---It is not unlikely but you can find ſomewhat to ſay in defence of this your ſelf-contradicting Doctrine; but I believe it will match your wit, were it ten times more, and prove too hard for you. Look to it; if your diſputations againſt Prelacie ſtand, down goes this main aſſertion of yours. If your diſputations againſt Prelacie be found to have a hollow and falſe bottom, then you have made you work for repentance, you have greatly injured the Church of God, and particularly the Church of* England, *and have deceived a great many. Look what* Bellarmine *maketh the Pope to be to all the Paſtors, Churches, and Chriſtians through the world,* That do you make this which you call the Church Univerſal: for you ſay that particular Churches, as headed by their reſpective Biſhops and Paſtors, are parts and members of another Church called the Church Univerſal: *By which aſſertion you ſet up an Univerſal*

Head or Government over all the Paſtors, Churches, and Chriſtians in the world beſides Chriſt; and you ſay this is of Divine Inſtitution; and you lay the concord of all the Churches upon it. Do but grant the Papiſts this one aſſertion, that particular Churches, as headed by their reſpective Paſtors, are parts and members of the Univerſal Church, as a City is of a Kingdom, and overthrow the Popes headſhip over all if you can. It will follow that there muſt be, beſides Chriſt, an Univerſal Eccleſiaſtical Monarch on Earth, either perſonal or collective, *who muſt have the Supreme power.* P. 96. *But indeed you have gone beyond* Bellarmine *in ſeting up Papal Monarchy. Your other aſſertion ſets up* Atheiſm, *by making the Holy God the Author and Founder of two eſſentially different Churches, or* Church-Forms. *According to* Bellarmines *aſſertion for the Pope, there would be Paſtors,* &c. *But according to your aſſertion, all the world muſt be Atheiſts, of no Religion at all.*---P. 224, 225. *Your diviſion of the Church into* Univerſal *and* particular, *is plainly againſt that Rule in Logick;* Membra omnis boniæ diviſionis debent eſſe inter ſe oppoſita. *But in this your diviſion the* Membra dividentia are not inter ſe oppoſita: you oppoſe the ſame thing againſt itſelf. You make the Church at *Corinth* a particular Church,---The whole or the Univerſal Church at *Corinth* is ſound and good. *You plainly leave out of your deſcription, the differencing Form or token of that which you call a particular Church, and that is* Neighbourhood, *or dwelling or abiding in this or that place,---you make a new eſſential of Church-Membership and Church-Communion, and lay the peace of all the Churches on it, and ſay it is Di-*

vine

vine, ſure, harmleſs, fitted to the intereſt of all good men. *This ſtartles me, I ſtrive to be ſilent and cannot: The more I ſtrive, the more I am overcome* *. Mr. Cawdrey *was lately with me, and we had Conference about this point,---ſuſpecting mine own judgment; I have conferred with divers about your other Notions, two Churches, or two Church-Forms differing eſſentially; and they cannot apprehend how it can ſtand! you make the Univerſal Church-Form, and the particular Church-Form to differ eſſentially, and this by Divine Law. I prove to you from the nature of the thing it ſelf, and the expreſs word of God, that the Univerſal Church of God at* Corinth, *and the particular Church of God at* Corinth, *are one and the ſame.----To oppoſe the Univerſal and particular Church, and ſay they differ eſſentially, is to oppoſe the ſame thing againſt itſelf, and make the Lord Jeſus Chriſt the Authour and Founder of ſelf-ſubverting Principles.* P. 226, 227. *As for that other point, of the Church particular being part of the Church Univerſal, it is to ſay, that the whole Church at* Corinth *is a part of the whole Church, which is abſurd.*

* Alas! then there is no remedy!

Reader, I muſt not Tranſcribe the whole Book: the reſt is too like this; exerciſe your patience in receiving a ſhort Anſwer to the ſeveral parts which ſeemeth needful.

CHAP.

CHAP. IV.

A Defence againſt the foreſaid Accuſations.

§ 1. WHat Chriſtians heart can chooſe but mourn for the Church of God, and the puzzling confounding temptations of the ignorant, that muſt hear men charged thus publickly with Atheiſm, and the overthrow of all Religion, for that which the Chriſtian world agreeth in; and this by Preachers of profeſſed humility, ſincerity and zeal? How ſhall the unlearned know when they are ſafe? yea, what ſnares are thus laid to rob men of their time, as well as their Faith and Charity? I muſt not give ſuch lines their proper names: but I will ſay that it remembreth me of *Iſa.* 1. 6. and it cryeth out *unclean, unclean.* How few words of *Truth*, and *ſoberneſs*, and *ſoundneſs*, can you number among all theſe? Had he written and publiſhed it in his ſleep, as ſome talk, and walk, it were ſome excuſe! But for a Man, a Miniſter, awake, and after publick admonition, deliberately, on conſultation, a ſecond time, to talk at this rate in the Preſs!---And yet cannot we be endured without their Ceremonies, *&c.* When the *Friendly Debater* and Mr. *Shurlocke* have compared ſuch Books as this with thoſe that they reprehended, perhaps they will ſay, *Iliacos intra muros, &c.*

To begin at the end, I am ſorry to read what he

he ſaith of the *Divers he Conferred with, &c.* 1. I never till now read or heard Papiſt, Proteſtant, or any Chriſtian of his mind: And, alas, are divers of it now? Are Conformiſts come to that? Either they were at Manhood, or in breeches at leaſt, or not: If not, he ſhould have choſen other Counſellers: if yea, were they Laymen or Clergymen? He was to blame if he took up with the former alone in ſuch a caſe. If the later, he greatly diſgraceth them.

But we muſt ſay ſomewhat of our Atheiſtical Errours. The beginning of his words, which ſay the ſame thing which he ſo abominateth, I will not charge with contradiction in ſence from the reſt: for if he mean the ſame thing by [*One* and *Two*, *A Church and no Church*, *A part and no part*, *Yea and Nay*] they are no contradictions in ſence. And indeed I cannot perceive that he underſtandeth what he readeth and anſwereth, nor well what he ſaith. And therefore I am not ſure when I underſtand him; but I will review ſome of the things that his words ſeem to accuſe in order.

§ I. *The Univerſal Church*, as I *defined it*, *is a True Church*. Proved: Where there is a true Church-Head and a Body of all Chriſtians on earth, united and ſubjected to that Head by mutual conſent and Covenant, there is a true Univerſal Church: but ſuch is that which I named and defined as the Church Univerſal.---*Ergo*.---The Major is from the definition to the thing denominated. As to the Minor, 1. That Chriſt is the True Head. 2. And all Chriſtians the Univerſal true body, (viſible as Baptized, and myſti-

cal

cal as Heart-Covenanters.) 3. And that mutual Covenanting is a sufficient bond for this Church-union, the Christian Reader will chide me if I stay to prove.

§ II. *Particular Churches existent, are true Churches in Essence.* Proved to him: 1. He oft confesseth this and the former. 2. A *true pars dirigens & pars subdita, necessarily qualified, ad esse, and united in those relations for Church-ends, are a true particular Church: But such are many existent particular Churches* (and all that I defined:) *Ergo.* 1. That a true Bishop, at least with his Presbyters, is a true *pars dirigens:* 2. And a qualified flock, a true *pars subdita:* 3. And that such are found united in these relations, I will take for granted with the Reader, except Mr. *Ch.* And the Major is the definition.

§ III. That the *Relative union of the governing Part*, or *neareſt Head to the Governed body, is the ſpecifying form.* The proof being *de Ente politico & notione Logicâ*, is the consent of all *Politicks*, *Logicks*, and use of speech by the professours of both, known to us in the world. I oft enough distinguishing *de nomine æquivoco*, have told men that it is not every Christian Assembly that we speak of, but *ſocietas politica.* And all Politicks call the form of the Government, the specifying form of the Politick Society, throughout the known world. So Monarchy, Aristocracie, Democracie, are specifying forms of Republicks: And Schools, Armies, Navies, have divers Relative forms, specifyed by the union of the various Regent Relative parts to the rest.

§ IV. *The Form is a chief essential part.*

§ V.

§ V. *Therefore divers ſpecifying forms, prove divers eſſences in ſpecie.*

§ VI. *It is not the generical form that ſpecifieth.* Elſe all things that are *ejuſdem generis*, ſhould be *ejuſdem ſpeciei*. All bodies are not Animate, nor all Animals Men, nor all Men Biſhops or Phyſicians.

§ VII. The Genus denominated without defining it, with the *ſpecifying form or difference, makes the Definition of the Species*. Elſe the Definition of the *ſpecies infima*, would be confounded by the conjunct definitions of all the ſuperiour *Genera*: He that defineth a King, muſt not put in it the definition of *Homo*, of Animal, of *Vivens*, of *Corpus* and *Anima*, of *ſubſtantia*.

§ VIII. *The higheſt ſpecies muſt be defined by its proper higheſt form, though not the ſubordinate ſpecies.* The King muſt be put in the *definition* of a Kingdom, but not of a City, Country, Church, Family, School; he is there ſuppoſed in a Kingdom. And ſo of others.

§ IX. The higher *Genera* muſt not be named in the definition of the ſpecies, but the next, which is the ſuperiour ſpecies. Therefore Mr *Ch.* miſtook his Art of defining, when he ſaid I miſt it, by naming Chriſt as the Head of the Church Univerſal, and adding that I blame my ſelf that defining of a particular Church. As in Relations it is not the ultimate end, but the neareſt that muſt be in the definition; ſo is it not the *higheſt* but the next *Genus* that muſt be named. In defining all the lower ſpecies, the higher *Genera* are but implyed in the naming of *genus proximum*, and not named.

§ X.

§ X. The *Relation of Jesus Christ*, and of a *humane Bishop*, are not the same Relation, in specie, though both be called Heads or Rulers. Proved: There is not the same *subjectum*, nor the same *fundamentum*, *vel ratio fundandi*, nor the same *Correlate*, (for all the Christian world and a Diocese are not the same) nor the same *neareſt terminus*: *Ergo*, not the same *Relation*.

§ XI. Therefore the Universal Church Headed by Christ onely, and a particular Church subordinately Headed by a Bishop or Clergy-head, are essentially divers, and two: Proved: Where the formal specifying Head or Regent part is two, or divers, and the Body divers, *&c.* there the societies are divers *in specie*, or essentially: But so it is here: *Ergo.* That *One and One* are *Two*, I will not undertake to prove to Mr. *Ch.* nor think it needful to prove to others, nor yet that Christ is *One*, and a Bishop one; and not the same. That Christ is the formal Head of the Universal Church, all Christians confess, and therefore to be named in the definition, whether Mr. *Ch.* will or not, and not supposed: Baptismal Union and subjecting to him, maketh us Christians, and not supposeth us such (in visible Church-state.) That Christ is not the *formal specifying* Head of a *particular Church* as such, but of the *Universal*, and so the Supream Head only of the particular, is proved before. 1. Because the specifying *forma totius heterogenei*, is not the specifying form of the parts. 2. Else all that Christ is Supreme Ruler to, should be such particular Political Churches: which is false; It is not true of single persons, of Christian Armies, Troops, Markets, Parliaments,

ments, Courts, &c. as ſuch. 3. Chriſt himſelf by his Apoſtles hath ordained a ſubordinate humane ſpecies of Church-heads or Rulers. 4. From parity of caſes: Natural and Political. The *forma animalis*, is not *forma hominis*, nor *forma hominis forma oculi, manus, pedis*, &c. The General is the formal Head of the Army, but not of a Regiment, but the Colonel: Nor the Colonel of a Troop, but the Captain; nor the King of a City, but the Maior or other ſubordinate head: Nor the King or Maior of a Family, School, Colledge, but the *Pater-familias*, the Maſter, the Rector, &c. Depoſe the ſubordinate Head, and it's part of the Kingdom ſtill, but no Family, School, Colledge, Troop, Regiment, &c. All Mankind that profeſs dealing in ſuch ſubjects, (as far as I know) are agreed in all this. As to the Body related alſo, a Dioceſs is not all the Chriſtian world.

§ XII. *Every true particular or ſingle Church, is part of the Univerſal, (which is Headed only by Chriſt.)* That it is *part of the Univerſal*, I know not that ever man denyed till now, that a conformable pious Divine maketh this with the former Atheiſtical, making God and Chriſt a deceiver, driving all Religion out of the world, Popery, worſe, &c. Proved. *Quæ unita totum conſtituunt ſunt partes: At Eccleſiæ omnes particulares, cum membris cæteris & Chriſto Capite totam ſeu Univerſam Eccleſiam Redemptorum conſtituunt: Ergo, ſunt Eccleſiæ Univerſæ partes. Eccleſia univerſa conſtat ex horum unione. Ergo, hæc omnia ſunt ejus partes.* Again, If the ſingle Churches be no parts of the Univerſal, either they are Co-ordinate

nate Churches with the Universal, or there is no Universal. If the Universal be *All* without them, than they are none: If not, then it is not Universal, if there be other Churches which are no parts of it. Again, If they be no parts of the Church Universal, they are no parts of the Body or peculiar people or Kingdom of Christ, (for that is but one, 1 *Cor.*12. *Eph.* 4. 15, 16. & 5. *&c.*) But they are parts of the Body of Christ. *Ergo.*

§ XIII. *To say that the whole Church*, e. g. at *Corinth*, *and the whole Church in the world are the same*, and what's predicated of one is also of the other, is a saying----not to be justly denominated. The *subjectum*, *relatum*, *correlatum*, *fundamentum*, *terminus*, *proximus*, and so the relation are divers. The whole Church and its Head, and a part and its subordinate Head, are not the same. The Kingdom and the City, the City and a Parish or Ward, the University and a Colledge, the Man and a hand, *&c.* are not the same.

§ XIV. *To say* as he doth, that a *Family is not a part of the street*, or that of the City, and *London no Member or part of the Kingdom*, is stuff that----I will not name: an ill foundation for the charge of *Atheism*, *Blasphemy*, and all Impiety. But I am out of all fear that he should make one Proselyte that's *sani cerebri*. If any accuse him of less than denying God and Christ, even but of Deposing the King from most of his Kingdoms, and saying that *London*, and so of every one City, Corporation, *&c.* is no part of it, I would desire them to allow him his own Exposition: for he meaneth not so ill as he saith.

§ XV. To say that *one whole cannot be a Member*

ber or part of another whole, is yet, if possible, more than the former. What, may not *Corpus politicum* be a member of a larger body Politick? Is there any *part* of the *Universe* if this be true? at least save *Atomes* and *Spirits*: And in what sense an *Atome*, or *Anima*, or *Spiritus*, may be called *totum*, *Scaliger*, and the Schoolmen, and Metaphysicks, commonly tell you. Are not whole stones part of Mountains? and whole Trees of the Forrest? and whole Herbs of the whole Garden? and whole Fields of the whole Countrey? and whole Parishes of the whole Dioceſs and County, and those of the Kingdom? and that of *Europe*? and that of the world? Is not a whole hand or foot part of a whole man? Is not the material Universe made up of compounded parts? What a trick has he found to exempt us all from Government? every man may say, *I am a whole man: therefore* I am no part of the Bishop of *Londons* Dioceſs, or of the Parish, or of the Family. Deny or destroy all such parts, and you deny or destroy the whole. Did he think that all Noun Substantives signified the same thing, which have the same Adjective; and that a *whole Man*, and a *whole Dog*, or *World*, are all one?

§ XVI. It's little better when he argueth that homogeneal parts make not a new *species*. As if he could prove that the Church is *Totum homogeneum*. Are not Christ and Christians, the King and the Subjects of the Universal Church, *partes heterogeneæ, in esse politico relativo*? Are not Bishops and Laicks *partes heterogeneæ*? Had he forgot how much of his Book is to prove even Bi-

ſhops and Presbyters as widely different? No Chriſtian denyeth it of the Church Univerſal, nor any of ſingle Churches, that denyes not a Miniſtry, and the being of ſuch Churches as Political.

§ XVII. While thus he maketh National Churches Metropolitical, Dioceſane, Parochial and the very Independent, which he moſt revileth, *all one*, or of *one eſſential ſpecies*, it ſeemeth that he knoweth not how he unſaith moſt that he ſaid before.

§ XVIII. It is little better that he maketh ſeveral Churches, *viz.* at *Paris* and at *Plimouth*, *&c.* to differ only in *Number* and *Place*. 1. Do not the Popiſh, Proteſtant, Epiſcopal, and Preſbyterian, differ in the *Form* of Government? 2. Do not thoſe of the ſame Form differ as *Individuals* by their ſeveral Rulers? beſides abundance of accidental differences?

§ XIX. And what Doctrine is it to ſay, *Chriſt's Body is one; not as one is oppoſed to multitude*, but to *diviſion and deſtruction?* Hath Chriſt a multitude of Bodies univocally ſo called? even ſuch a Body as we treat of? Hath Chriſt many Univerſal Churches containing all Chriſtians headed by Chriſt?

§ XX. When he had ſo groſly wronged himſelf, as to ſay, *It is an errour in the art of defining, to ſay* of the Univerſal Church, it is *Headed by Chriſt himſelf*; what other Head or formal Regent part doth he name? will he have another? or will he have none in the definition? Is that the art of defining?

§ XXI. It's little better to ſay, *Is is an errour*

in

to define the Universal Church without Pastors, as the Assembly did. What! a better Logician than all the Assembly too? Alas, how fell the good man under this temptation? He instanceth in a body defined without Liver, Stomack, &c. But 1. I hope he doth not think all is excluded that is not to be named? 2. Is there no better definition of a man, than *Animal implume, bipes, &c.* or one that hath a Liver and Stomack, &c. When to the *Entelechia* or *anima*, he added *Corpus organicum*, *Aristotle* thought he said enough of the body. Is not *Animal rationale* a just definition of a man, without naming his *Liver* and *Spleen*, or *Heart?* Is not the *Genus & differentia* enough for a definition? *Definitiones debent esse breves; & nihil otiosum continere: otiosum est quo ablato, definitio reliqua rei essentiam explicat.* A Kingdom is defined by naming no more than the King and Subjects in general, without naming Judges, Justices, Sheriffs, &c. There are no constitutive principles in Nature, but *Mater, materiæ dispositio & forma:* And the imperfect definitions of accidents, must be as like as may be to those of substances. The *specifying form* here, is only *Christ the Head so related:* Though he made *Christians* before *Ministers*, and were all Pastors dead, the Church were still Christs Universal Body; yet I grant it is not a just *organized body* without Pastors: but that maketh them but to be the nobler part of the disposed matter: men do not use to play the Anatomists in definitions, and instead of *Animal*, or of *Corpus organicum*, to name *Heart, Stomack, Lungs, &c.* But it is a *healthful man* that Mr. *Ch.* is defining. *Answ.* 1. But it

is not a *healthful Church*, but a *true Church in essence* that I was defining. 2. If it had been otherwise, the name of the parts need not enter the definition of health. And are these his *saving truths?*

§ XXII. And what an intimation is it, that if *there be an essential difference between the Universal and particular Church*, there's none between the *Church and the world*, the *righteous and the wicked*, *Heaven and Hell*. These things are fitter to be answered by *Interjections* (which be no words; but *voces non vocabula*) than by Speech. If Christ and a Bishop *in esse relationis politicæ* differ essentially, must good and bad, Heaven and Hell be all one? If an Army, and a Regiment, and a Troop, differ in their formal specifying essences, must a Subject and a Rebel, the Court and the Gallows therefore be all one. *Prob! apage!*

§ XXIII. Next he asks, *How can any man know the right Church then?* Answ. What! no way but by making Christ and a Bishop formally the Head? we know the Universal Church by its true definition; and a true particular Church by its true definition and properties.

§ XXIV. Yea, he saith, *we shall never be able to confute Popery and Infidelity by this Doctrine.* Answ. Alas, will the good man turn Papist or Infidel, unless the *Universal Church* and a *Diocesan* have the same *specifying difference*, or *formal Head?* Then what remedy?

§ XXV. I have no Interjection deep enough for that which followeth, *viz. This Doctrine supposeth two essentially different Churches: The Universal Church without Pastors, (Putares) and of*

this

this Christ is Head : particular Churches, of which Christ is no Head] *Putares !* Where said I any such thing ! Is this lawful ? As if 1. there must be no *Pastors*, unless they be the *formal Head* of the *Universal Church*. 2. And as if there must be *no Christ* the *Supream Head*, if the Bishop be the *formal differencing specifying subordinate Head :* and all but the *named parts* are denyed : As if he would have more than the *genus proximum*, and *differentia specificans* in a definition : yea, even the *genus supremum !* and Christ shall be the specifying Head, or none !

§ XXVI. He saith, [*So the same thing shall be contrary to itself.*] As if 1. Christ and a Bishop, in formal relation were proved to be the same. 2. Or things subordinate were contrary, (which he denyeth himself.)

§ XXVII. He saith, [*Christs Church in this world is but one.*] Answ. If there be but one particular Church, 1. Then numerically the Church of *London* and *Basil* are one : And then if I separate not from the Church at *Basil*, I separate not from the Church of *London*. 2. If *de specie* there be but one, then a Patriarchal, Diocesane, Parochial, Presbyterian, and Democratical Church are but of one species : And why then did you use so many words to tell us of the need of Bishops over Bishops, and of the several sorts of supra-ordinate Church-Rulers ? Then a National Church and a Parish-Church are but one.

§ XXVIII. He addeth, [*Quæ conveniunt uno tertio, conveniunt inter se ; but the Church Universal and particular agree in uno tertio, &c.*] Answ. As if *Convenientia generica*, were *convenientia tota-*

lis vel ſpecifica? or, *Convenientia partialis & totalis, Accidentalis & Eſſentialis*, were all one? What pretty Logick is here, to prove a King and a Conſtable all one, becauſe they are both Men, both Chriſtians, and both Rulers? I hope then a Biſhop and a Presbyter are all one, that in your ſorry ſenſe agree in *uno tertio?* But let us hear the inferred Charge againſt us.

§ XXIX. *An Addition* of *Homogeneous Particles* (ſaith he) *makes no eſſential differences.* Anſw. Chriſt and a Biſhop are heterogeneous: Yea, a *Dioceſane* and a Pariſh-Prieſt: have you proved that they are not? or that they are?

§ XXX. *It will neceſſarily infer that God is contrary to himſelf*, ſaith he. Anſw. O Temerity in the dark! that is, unleſs his Church-relation be the ſame with the Biſhops? As if the King be contrary to himſelf, if his Kingdom and a Corporation or School be not of the ſame ſpecies?

§ XXXI. He ſaith, [*If this opinion ſtand, Religion cannot ſtand. An.* Do you mean in *you* or in *me*, or *all others?* Do you reſolve to caſt away all Religion, if Chriſt and a Biſhop be not the ſame informing regent parts of the Church Univerſal and particular? Think better of it firſt; for Religion is more neceſſary than ſo. Do you think that the Chriſtian world, which hath ever been of the opinion which you deteſt, had never any Religion? Nor hath now any? Which way do Churches that are *parts* of the Univerſal, caſt out all Religion?

§ XXXII. *If Chriſt ſet up two eſſentially different Church-Forms, he is not the Saviour but the deceiver of the world.* Anſw. And muſt *Chriſt* bear

bear ſuch a charge as well as I? I ſhould ſooner have expected it from a Turk or Jew, than from you.

§ XXXIII. He ſaith, [*Why then do you blame turning Pariſh-Churches into Chappels, and making them but parts of a Dioceſane, as a Troop of an Army?*] Anſw. *Putide putares.* When ſhall we meet with a true Sentence? It is not for making them *parts of a Dioceſane* Church as *Troops* of an Army, but for making them no *Political true Churches*, but disbanding all the Troops, by making them no *Troops*, but ſuch parts of a Regiment as Squadrons are. It is for putting down Inferiour Biſhops, and not for being themſelves Biſhops over them; yet on this doth he ground his charge of my *deceiving men, and wronging God and his Church*, &c.

§ XXXIV. He addeth, [*Look what* Bellarmine *maketh the Pope*, &c. *that do you*, &c. *for you ſay that particular Churches, as headed by their reſpective Biſhops and Paſtours, are parts of another Church called the Church Univerſal. By which aſſertion you ſet up an Univerſal Head —beſides Chriſt, and you ſay this is of Divine Inſtitution, and lay the Concord of all the Churches on it.*] Anſw. If you are *ſani Cerebri*, this is ſo groſs, that your *putarem* hath no excuſe. Had you not your ſelf repeated my definition, and carpt at thoſe very words, [*Headed only by Chriſt*] and many times your ſelf repeated it as my opinion. 2. Or had you tryed your wrangling wit to have proved, that [*if Chriſt only be aſſerted to be the Head*, I thereby aſſert another Head] or that [*If I make Biſhops particular ſpecifying Heads, I*

therefore assert a humane Universal Head,] you had some cloak for your *putarem*: But now—If you next print that I said that a Dog is a man, I will no more wonder at it than at this. See Reader how my *Church-Concord* is oppugned, and by what weapons Satan doth that work. As if he that saith the King only is the specifying Head of the Kingdom, and the Captain of his Troop, or the Dioceſans of a Dioceſs, were a Traytor, and did aſſert another Head of the Kingdom than the King.

§ XXXV. *Do but grant the Papiſts* (ſaith he) *this one aſſertion, that particular Churches, as headed by their reſpective Paſtors, are parts and members of the Univerſal, as Cities of a Kingdom, and overthrow the Popes Headſhip over all if you can. It will follow, that there muſt be beſides Chriſt, an univerſal Monarch on earth, &c.* Anſw. 1. *Affirmanti incumbit probatio.* Did you think we muſt take your bare word in ſo great a caſe? Do you ſay one word to prove your affirmation? Muſt we all turn Papiſts upon your immodeſt naked ſaying, it is ſo? 2. But your immodeſty is in this exceſſive to me, that have written *two Books* againſt *Johnſon, alias Terret*, and the later but lately and largely, to prove that the Church hath no *Univerſal Head* but Chriſt, notwithſtanding the particular Regency of the Biſhops; and for you to give me not a word of anſwer to them, and bid me now *prove it if you can*, when I have voluminouſly proved it! This is ſuch dealing as I will not name. — 3. But I am heartily ſorry, what ever did it, that you are got ſo neer to Popery. As if you will be a Papiſt, unleſs all the writers of the

Chriſti-

Christian world are deceived, and if the particular Church be a part of the Universal, which dare boldly swear it is, and sober men doubt not.

§ XXXVI. He adds, [*Indeed you have gone beyond* Bellarmine *in setting up Papal Monarchy. Your other assertion sets up Atheism, by making the holy God the authour and founder of two essential different Churches, or Church-Forms.*] Answ. *Putares.* But if all the Christian world be of the same mind, do they all set up *Atheism*, and are you only free? As for *Tho. Hooker* whom you cited, though it be twenty four years, or thereabouts, since I read Mr. *Hudson* and him, (and will not waste away my time in perusing them) my memory doubts not that it was only a *Universal Church* made one by *one universal humane policie*, that he denied; and that they differed but about words. Did ever Christian before you, deny particular Churches to be *distinct policies*, and parts of the *Universal?* Have we so many Books written of *Ecclesiastical Policie*, and is there no such thing? or no Churches that are *Politick Societies?*

§ XXXVII. He adds, [*According to your assertion, all the world must be Atheists, of no Religion at all.*] Answ. Then all the world of Christians are so; for as far as writings notifie, they are generally of this mind. Alas, Brother, did you shew this to any man before you Printed it? for their honour I must think you did not; and for your sake I wish you had.

§ XXXVIII. He adds, [*Your division of the Church into Universal and particular, is plainly against that Rule in Logick, Membra omnis bonæ divisionis*

visionis

visionis debent esse inter se oppositæ] *but you oppose the same thing against itself.* Answ. Thus do men humble themselves by forsaking humility! Had it not been better for you to have let your Logick alone, than to bewray that which you might have concealed? Are not *diversa* distinguishable as well as *opposita?* And is there no diversity *in parte essentiæ*, (as in *subalternis*) where there is not a diversity *in totâ essentia*, (as there is *in summis generibus?*) is there not both *diversity and opposition*, *inter totum & partem*, and between the species of an universal and particular Society? Are they not *Relative opposita?* May you not distinguish Army, and Regiment, and Troop, Kingdom and City, Christ and a Bishop? *&c.*

§ XXXIX. He adds, [*You make the Church at* Corinth *a particular Church.*] Answ. And do not all Christians? Is it all the Christian world?

§ XL. *You plainly* (saith he) *leave out of your description the differing form or token of that which you call a particular Church*, and that is, *Neighbourhood*, &c. Answ. *Anne putares?* 1. Have I so often expresst it, and yet will you say so? 2. But it was in descriptions indeed, and I was far from your Logical belief, that *Neighbourhood is the differencing form.* And I hope no one else is of your mind. 1. If Neighbourhood be the *differencing form*, then all Christian Neighbours are particular Churches: But that is false: *Ergo.* — 1. Those that dwell together only for Trade, are not therefore Churches. 2. Those that hold that there are no particular Churches or Pastors, but that all Christians are as Priests. 3. Those that hold that the Minister of the Parish where they

live

ive is no true Miniſter, nor the Pariſh a true Church. 4. Thoſe that profeſs themſelves Members of no particular Church. 5. Thoſe that profeſs to be no Members of that Church, but of another. 6. Papiſts and Sectaries that ſtand in oppoſition to that Church. 7. Thoſe that dwell near another Pariſh-Church, and many miles from their own, are not Members by proximity. 8. Thoſe that are Excommunicated, which is *de facto* all profeſſed Non-Conformiſts. 9. In places where the Magiſtrate tyeth not Churches to Pariſh-bounds, perſons of the ſame ſtreet and houſe may be of ſeveral Churches. 10. No man that conſenteth not is a Church-Member. 11. And who knoweth not that *proximity* is but *diſpoſitio materiæ*, and not the differencing form? All theſe ſingular novelties ſhould have had better proof than theſe dry aſſertions, contrary to all Chriſtian ſenſe.

§ XLI. [*This ſtartles me: I ſtrive to be ſilent and cannot*, (ſaith he) *and the more I ſtrive, the more I am overcome.*] Anſw. If you are ſo far gone, I ſhall hereafter, I think, without any ſtriving with my ſelf, let that which is within you talk on, and not reſiſt you. For who can hold that which will away? But I wiſh you the benefit of ſome ſtiptick remedy, and a ſober mind.

§ XLII. [*I prove to you* (ſaith he, when there is nothing like one proving word) &c. *you make the Lord Jeſus the authour and founder of ſubverting principles.*] Anſw. Read the Ninth Commandment. I conclude with theſe requeſts to him, as my true friend; *viz.* to conſider: *Qu.* 1. Whether a man ſo far from perſecution, and yet con-

condemning us of Atheism, blaspheming, and de-
stroying all Religion, &c. be not much more un-
charitable, than they that charge no such thing
upon us, but trouble us for refusing Forms and
Ceremonies? or is it not the same spirit?

Qu. 2. Whether he justifie not the silencing
and ruining of all whom he so accuseth? should
not such impious Atheists be silenced?

Qu. 3. If he knew that the generality of the
Christian world in all ages hold what he thus
censureth, what will he call it, to charge all Chri-
stians so far with Atheism, and casting out all
Religion, and making God and Christ a decei-
ver? If he knew it not, what will he call it, to
venture thus to publish such an accusation, before
he knew that which an ordinary Inhabitant of
the world might so easily have known? As if he
had published [*All that say a City is specified by its
subordinate Form of Government, and is a part of
the Kingdom, specified by the Monarch, are Traytors,
and depose the King, or make him a deceiver and no
King, and deny all obedience.*] What will you call
this dealing?

Qu. 4. Was it well done to write such a Book,
while he understood so very little of the very
plainest passages which he wrote against?

Qu. 5. Was it excusable to confess some er-
rour of the last, and to add far worse, and after
warning a second time, so to speak evil of what
he understood not?

Qu. 6. Was it humility to make ostentation of
the Logick he understood not.

Qu. 7. Doth not the extreme bold confidence
of the falsest of his own conceptions, shew a ve-
ry

ry unhumbled overvaluing of his own understanding? To be ignorant is common to Mankind; yea, and to be much ignorant of our ignorance, and to think that we know more than we do: But to have so little sense of this calamity, and so little suspicion of ones own understanding, as to be confident to such a height of accusation of the grossest falshoods, where a lad of fourteen years old, that had read any thing of Logick and Politicks, might have better taught him; (that I say not, the reason and use of Mankind) this seemeth somewhat beyond the common measure of self-conceitedness.

Qu. 8. Whether the great number of asserted untruths here, shew not some want of necessary tenderness, or care of writing?

CHAP. IV.

Mr. Chenies *Accusations of me about Church-Covenants, and rigid Independencie, and the odiousness hereof, considered.*

§ 1. When he had said, that [*it leads to two contrary Gods, which is to make no true God*, p. 69.] He proceedeth [*Mr.* B. *hath devised and framed two Covenants, the one to make a man a Member of the Church Universal, the other of the particular*, p. 97. *I will shew*, 1. *That this is the same with the upstart way of the Independents*: 2. *The unsoundness of it*, p. 101. *Mr.* B. *and the Independents now, are contrary to their own princi-*

ple

ple in baptizing the Infants of Non-Confederates, p. 129. [*I do utterly withstand it as Wickedness and Abomination in Gods Church; I am to die and burn at a stake before I yield to any such thing: This is Mr.*Baxters *way: He offers it to Bishop* Morley *and Bishop* Gunning, *in his Preface to his last Book of Concord, that posterity may see what it is that he would have had, and laboured to set up in all the Churches: And accordingly, let both the present and future Ages see and know,* p. 130. *Your way is not so innocent as that of re-baptizing. For the very matter and terms of your Church-Covenant are unsafe, and plainly Schismatical! As if Constables and people of each Town must Confederate to be a Corporation, an Independent body having all jurisdiction within themselves, and such as will not enter into this Confederacy, must be counted none of the Kings Subjects. — To say there are no Churches in the world but a few Independent Churches, — were to go beyond* Brownism: *It were rather to teach Infidelity: such an opinion would be abhorred by all: Now Mr.*Baxter *and the Independents Doctrine saith it. — Their errour, should they hold it habitually, predominantly, and practically, would be certainly their damnation.* — p. 141, [*I see not but Pagans, gross Hereticks, Apostates, Thieves and Robbers might combine together and say, I take thee for my Pastor, and I take you for my people: Doth not your Doctrine infer it?* p. 143. *If I yield to their assertion, I must subvert the office of Christ and his Apostles, and all his faithful Ministers, and all the Churches to this day; which I will not do for fear of the censure of any man living, no nor of a whole Council of men,* p. 57. *The way that Mr.* Baxter *offers,*

fers, ſeems to be a worſe way,—— It is the way of rigid Independencie. —— Indeed Mr. B. in all his Writings ſeems to be againſt the Office of Lay-Elders: But that he is not for them under another notion, as Heads and delegates of the people, mutually choſen by the Paſtor and people, for aſſiſtance in Diſcipline, may be doubted. He ſeems to hint at it, &c.

§ 2. How little truth is in all this, and abundance ſuch? 1. either it is truth that I *am for rigid Independency, or not.* If not,—if yea, I am glad that the Independent way is no worſe. I am not much acquainted with them: But if this man ſay true, 1. They are for no Covenanting, but conſent to the relation ſignifyed. 2. They are not for binding any to continue in that relation. 3. They are not for binding any from a regular uſe of any other Miniſter, or Churches Communion. 4. In places where Pariſhes are divided by Law, and the ordinary attendance on the Paſtors Miniſtration goeth for a ſign of conſent, they are true Churches and Members that thus ſignifie it; and *ad eſſe* it is uſually enough, though *ad bene eſſe* in doubtful caſes the more expreſs, as more intelligible *cæteris paribus* is beſt. 5. They are againſt an Office of Lay-Elders, diſtinct from Miniſters of the Word and Sacraments, as of Gods inſtitution for Church-government. 6. They are againſt Democracie, or the Church-governing power of the People. 7. They take reformed Pariſh-Churches for the beſt Order, not taking all for Members that are in the Pariſh, but all the capable. 8. They are againſt gathering Churches out of ſuch Pariſh-Churches, without great neceſſity. 9. They are greatly againſt requiring

quiring any qualification as necessary to Communion in point of holiness, but express consent to the Baptismal Covenant, or profession of Christianity, not disproved. 10. They make not the peoples *Election* of their Pastors necessary *ad esse*, but meer *consent*, though the Patron or others Elect them. 11. They suppose that the peoples *Election or consent* is not necessary to make a man a Minister in the Universal Church, but only to make him their *Pastor*. As to make a Physician, and to make him my *Physician*, differ. 12. They suppose that a true Minister officiateth as such, where ever he doth it. 13. They suppose that associations or correspondencies of Churches for concord and help, and Synods to that end, and dependencie on such Synods, is usually a duty where it can well be had; and needless discord a fault. 14. They refuse not to submit in practice to the instructions or admonitions of any general Visiter or Overseer of many Churches, called by some Archbishops. 15. They refuse not the precedency of one Pastor in every particular Church over the rest of the Presbyters. 16. They refuse him not the name of the Bishop, nor yet to submit to his negative voice as of the *Quorum* (or the Archbishops either) in Ordinations and all great publick matters. 17. They are for separating from no Christians, further than they separate from Christ, or would force them to sin; but are for universal Love and Concord. 18. They are for obeying the Magistrate in all lawful things belonging to his function. 19. They take the most extensive Love, Peace, and Concord for the most desirable and best. 20. It is

next

next their obedience to Christ and his sufficient Laws; the great reason why they are against the terms imposed in most places of the Christian world, where things unnecessary and suspected are made necessary to Communion. Reader, Mr. *Ch.* is so honest a man, that it were unjust to take him for a deliberate studied Lyar. Therefore seeing he saith that *my way is rigid Independency*, and oft maketh me a *downright Independent*, I that know my own Judgement, and knew not theirs so well as he seems to do, am glad to hear that they are no worse, and that they are wronged by such as accuse them of denying any of those Twenty points.

§ 3. And supposing that he saith true, and that they hold but *my way*, as he calls it, I will now try the force and honesty of his charge against them.

And first, it savours of a spirit worse than his own, that when he had before used the word [*Oath*] as owned by me, and then said, he *repented of it*, that he still useth the word [*Covenant*] here as mine, instead of *Consent*, which is the word which I use, and over and over say, that I own no *Covenant but any signification of Consent to the relation*; onely because I said, that not *ad esse*, but *ad bene esse*, plain or expres Consent in doubtful cases is best. This smells of an ill intention; and now I will try his arguments against *this Consent*.

§ 4. P. 101. he saith Mr. *B. acts contrary to his own Principles in baptizing the Children of No confederates. The Universal and Particular Church make but one Church of God. He that refu-*

seth one Essential of Church-communion, is no Christian, and is to be debarred the Priviledges of Christians. But according to you, Non-confederates refuse one essential of Church-communion--- I may not baptize you, you are to me a Pagan.

Ans. *Putares, sed calumniaris.* Here is *fallacia æquivocationis*, and so *quatuor termini.* This Parish-Church and the Universal are not the same. The word *Church* in the Major, signifieth one thing, and in the Minor another. All is not essential to Communion in the Church Universal, which is essential to Communion with this or that, or any particular political Church. To the later, there must be, you say, *Neighbourhood*; and I say, *proper Pastors* and *Flocks* for *personal Communion.* But the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. was baptized into the Universal Church, and not into any *Neighbourhood, Parish, Diocess, Assembly,* or had any stated Pastor. He came into no Church-meeting. *Philip* (the Deacon supposed) was snatcht away from him in the open field, &c. Baptism as such, enters us into no particular Church. Your words [*you are a Pagan to me*] are too false for a Christian to have used. He that *believeth with all his heart* is no Pagan. I am a Minister of Christ to the world; but Infidels are not my Flock, or a Church. Catechizers should teach Children all this plain truth.

§ 5. II. P. 102. [Ask Mr. *Baxter* (saith he) *Whom do you mean by the word Church, and at last he must come to one man the Pastor (as the Papist the Pope.) He that covenanteth first, covenanteth with none but the Pastor. You change your terms. What Church must he covenant with that was first bapti-*

baptized? *Anſ.* Chriſt was baptized, and his firſt baptized Diſciple and he were the Embryo of the Univerſal Church, if you can prove that one was baptized alone. And as to a particular Church, the Gatherer at firſt is onely a Miniſter in the Church Univerſal, and authorized to that gathering which ſhall be the Foundation of his future relation: And the firſt perſon that conſenteth, and he, are not a proper Church; for it is an Embryo, and *in fieri*, as a Troop when the Captain hath liſted the firſt man. But uſually many are made Chriſtians firſt, and then they are *materia diſpoſita*, and Conſent maketh the Paſtors and them to be particular Churches, *Acts* 14. 23. *They ordained them Elders in every Church.* Elders of their own, *Acts* 20. the Elders of the Church of *Epheſus*, and ſo of the reſt of the Churches, are mentioned. And is the Captain a *Troop*, or the Paſtor a *Church*, if he be the gatherer of it?

§ 6. III. *You name not Chriſt*, (ſaith he) *but the Paſtor.* *Anſ.* When we ſay *Captain* A. B's *Troop*, we name not the *General.* When we ſay, *the Biſhop of* London's *Dioceſs*, *the King's Dominion*, &c. we name not Chriſt, or God: For onely the *Genus proximum* is to be in definitions. The Superiour are ſuppoſed: they are Chriſtians firſt.

§ 7. IV. *You ſay* (ſaith he) *that before this Covenant men are but hewed ſtones, that is, all the faithful are Pagans.* Anſ. *Putares.* To be prepared for Baptiſm is ſomewhat more than to be Pagans: *But till conſent Chriſtians are not Members of any particular Church.* The Eunuch was but

a hewn ſtone, as you call it, as to a formed *Congregation*; but he was no Pagan, but a Member of the Body of Chriſt.

§ 8. V. *This* (ſaith he) *makes the moſt excellent Miniſters, Apoſtles*, &c. *mere Lay-men, ſuch as go up and down preaching to Pagans where Chriſt is not known--- plainly ſubverts the Goſpel*, &c. *Anſ.* They are Chriſt's Miniſters, and not Lay-men, while they convert Pagans, and yet Pagans are no Church: And till they are a Church, no Apoſtle is a Paſtor of them as a Church. The Goſpel ſtandeth for all this.

§ 9. *But* (ſaith he) *may not a man be a Shepherd by calling and occupation, unleſs he have a Flock, as well as a Phyſician?* &c. *Anſ.* Either you quarrel *de re* or *de nomine*. If *de re*, do you mean any more than that he is authorized to gather and rule a Flock? If more, what is it? If not, you calumniate if you pretend that I deny this; but if it be onely *de nomine*, whether the *name* of a Paſtor may be given him that yet hath no Flock, or of a Captain to him that hath no Troop; I anſwer, 1. When you wrangle but about Names, try once more to ſtay that liſt of laying the *overthrow of the Goſpel* on your *Names*. 2. Titles of Relation may be given *aptitudinally ex intentione de futuro*: But if one may be called a *Paſtor by relation to an intended Flock*, much more to an actual *Flock*, and ſtill it is a *Relative* to *ſuch a Flock intended*. 3. Try in Scripture, and Councils, and all Church-writers, whether the title *Paſtor* be not uſually given onely to thoſe that have *actual Flocks*. But to avoid your quarrel, call you them by what name you liſt, if that will eaſe or pleaſe you. § 10.

§ 10. VI. *According to this Doctrine, a Minister hath no Office or Authority but just to those of his own charge, he preacheth elsewhere but as a gifted man. Anſ.* Still falſe, as to me, of whom you ſpeak! what a ſtrange Chain of Calumnies can you make? A Miniſter is 1. Chriſt's Officer to the world to convert them. 2. To gather a Church *in fieri*. 3. To officiate *pro tempore in any other Church*, as a Licenſed Phyſician to others (even to Phyſicians) doth his office.

§ 11. VII. *It maketh void* (ſaith he) *Gods Ordinance of Ordination: for either they are Miniſters by Ordination, or not: If yea, this Doctrine is erroneous. Anſ.* Unproved: Ordination, *ſine titulo*, maketh a man a Miniſter to the *World* and to the *Church indefinitely*. Ordination with *Inſtitution* doth that and more, *viz.* it tieth a Miniſter to a *conſenting people*. Your Writings are all ſtigmatized with the ſhame of naked affirmations without proof, and then forgetfully you oft ſay [*I have proved.*] Why may not *Conſent*, and *Ordination*, and *Inſtitution*, and *Induction* too, be all needful? Is a man and womans Conſent needleſs, unleſs the Miniſters marrying them be needleſs? May not a Town, Hoſpital, or Perſon, chuſe a Phyſician as *theirs* if he were licenſed before? If a Captain have commiſſion to raiſe a Troop, is conſent of the Liſted needleſs? So of a Major, a Pilot, or any relation which requires Conſent.

§ 12. VIII. *It inferreth* (ſaith he) *that the Church is before the Officers*, viz. *Pagans a Church. Anſ.* All fictions as to me to whom he ſpeaks: I ſaid before, they are as the Heart to the Body;

the *punctum saliens* is the first organical *part* to make the rest; but not a part of the Body till the Body be made. They are Ministers to gather Churches, and then Pastors of Churches onely by consent. And when Churches are gathered, and the Pastor dead, the people are *Intentionally* a *Society*, but *actually* but a *Community*, till a Pastor related to them make them a *politick Society*: And then *relata sunt simul*----

§ 13. IX. *This Doctrine puts a new clause into Baptism, which Christ never put in, and altereth Christianity* (saith he.) *Before I baptize you, I must have an antecedent Covenant or signified Consent from you to submit to me; and you must be baptized in the name of* Paul, *&c. No Church-covenant, no Church-member, no right to any Church-ordinance.* Ans. *Confundendo fortiter caluminaris.* 1. The Eunuch consented to be a Christian of the Church Universal, but not to be of a particular Church; without that Consent he had not been baptized: but this was not needful to it. 2. The dispute whether Lay-mens baptism be valid, I leave to you. But if yea, it is not necessary that I judge the Baptizer a Minister. If not, then it is necessary, and my consent is necessary to make me a Christian, but not him a Minister: But mutual consent is necessary to his Pastoral relation to a particular Church. 3. An Ordinance common to the Church Universal, and proper to a particular Church, should not be confounded, nor so much as the modal ministration. Do I adde to Baptism, if I say that by the Canons and Custom of all the Churches for one Thousand years, a man was not to be taken for the Bishop of any Church

Church without mutual consent? what's this to Baptism? And what temerity is it to feign men to wrong Christ by that which was his Institution, and so judged and used in all the Churches?

§ 14. X. [Saith he] *It maketh the people Church-Rulers or Co-partners in office with the Pastors, so that without their Consent they can do nothing; not baptize.* *Ans.* Of me the calumny hath no excuse, I have written so much to the contrary: Yea, the very *Act calumniated essentially* containeth the *contrary in it.* As he that consenteth to be a *Servant*, consenteth *not to be Master*, but to *obey*: So they that consent to be *Lay-members* of a Pastors Flock, consent that *he*, and not *they*, shall rule, and that they will be the *obeying part.* How could you wink so hard, as not to see that your false witness confuteth it self? And what if he cannot be their Governour *without their consent*, doth this give them any part in *governing?* Nay what if he cannot baptize a Non-consenter, or give him the Lords Supper, is the Refuser a Church-governour? The man had got a heap of Notions against the Independents in his mind, or his instigator that hath the same disease had thrust them in, and out they must come against he knew not whom or what, upon the word [*Consent.*] What work would he make in the Church, if he should deny the necessity of this *Consent*, and have the Church made a Prison where Infidels should be cram'd and drencht with the Sacrament?

§ 15. XI. [*It sets up* (saith he) *Rebaptization by a Law--- For it requireth of godly baptized*

zed ones an antecedent Covenant to be Members of the particular Church: As if a man should covenant to be a godly Citizen of London---- to be a Member of Gods Church at K. and hold communion therewith: the people are called on to be new Christians, as if they had been no Christians before] *Anſ.* It is a ſin to read ſuch words without grief and indignation. What! is every renewal of the Covenant of Godlineſs or Chriſtianity a *Rebaptizing*, or ſuppoſeth us *Pagans?* Is this made by a *Miniſter* a *heinous ſin?* Are we not to do it in every partaking of the Lords Supper? Yea, explicitely or implicitely in every prayer. Is Mr. *Allen*'s Book for *Covenanting*, and Mr. *Rawlet*'s of *Sacramental Covenanting*, ſuch *unchriſtening* Hereſies? Is it damnable or ſinful to covenant to be a godly Servant, or a godly Husband or Wife, or a godly Miniſter or Magiſtrate? Doth this ſuppoſe them ungodly before? with wat weapons are we aſſaulted?

§ 16. XII. He addes [*It bindeth people to be dwellers within the precincts of that one Church, to hear no other Miniſter, to joyn with no other Congregation.* *Anſ.* Concatenated Calumnies, as to me: They onely conſent to the Relation of Lay-members till they remove their dwelling or relation. They conſent to take that Church but as a part of the Univerſal, and therefore to hold juſt Communion with all others, and receive what benefit they can from any other Miniſters. I abhor a Covenant that renounceth Communion with the Univerſal Church, or any part of it, without neceſſary cauſe. *Putide hæc putares.*

§ 17. XIII. He addes, [*What ſhall godly Strangers,*

Strangers, Travellers, &c. *do? your Doctrine maketh them invaders.*] *Anſ.* 1. If I have no notice of their *conſent* to communicate with us *pro tempore*, they expect it not: And *de ignotis non judicat Eccleſia*; and *non apparere* is equal to *non eſſe*. If I have notice of their *Conſent*, it ſuppoſeth ſome notice that they are *baptized*, or *Chriſtians*, and have more right than Heathens to Communion: And if ſo, 1. They conſent to be Members of the Univerſal Church, and as ſuch I ſhall give them the Sacrament and Communion, though I were no Paſtor of any particular ſtated Church. 2. They conſent to a Tranſient Temporary Communion with me as a Miniſter in the Catholick Church. And 3. They conſent to tranſient temporary Communion with that particular Church, and tranſient temporary Communion I will give them; yea, and may call them tranſient Members of that Church; but no further any of theſe than they conſent. A Chriſtian giving evidence of his Chriſtianity, hath right to tranſient Communion in all Churches in the world where he cometh: yea, all are not bound to live in ſtated Churches; ſome are Travellers, ſome unſetled Embaſſadors, ſome Factors amongſt Heathens, ſome of no Habitation, Beggars, Pedlars, Tinkers, and ſuch wandring Trades; ſome live where is no Church with whom they may hold lawful Communion, *&c.* Now we have a new Divine riſen up in the end of the world, that ſeems to make all the ſetled Churches of Chriſt in the world for many hundred years, to be all Traitors to Chriſt, becauſe theſe wanderers muſt not conſent to their ſpecial relations,

tions, nor enjoy their proper Priviledges; and becauſe they conſent themſelves to a more ſetled relation and Communion than theſe wanderers or refuſers are capable of. What would all the old Church, that made ſo many Canons about their proper Communion, have thought of this mans Doctrine, if he had come among them at their Elections, Diſcipline, Diſtributions to the Widows and Poor, and ſaid, *Hold Sirs! You are all deſtroying Baptiſm and Chriſtianity, by conſenting to more towards one another than you owe to every unknown wanderer, or refuſer of a ſetled Church-ſtate?* As if with our new Politician all Cities and Corporations are Traytors, or deny or wrong the King, becauſe all Subjects are not Citizens, ſome being Vagrants, ſome in Villages, ſome Souldiers, ſome in odde Houſes, *&c.* and becauſe Cities conſent to a ſpecial ſort of Government which the reſt have not. Between the Anathematizers and theſe *over-wiſe Cenſurers*, there are few Chriſtians in the world that are not condemned as no Chriſtians for being found Chriſtians.

§ 18. XIV. He was aware that we ſay that every one that may come into the Temple is not a part of my ſpecial Charge as a Paſtor, which I cannot do for all: And he ſaith, [*It's all one to your Doctrine if he refuſe your Church-covenant—— The Miniſter all this while is no Miniſter; the People all this while are no Chriſtians.---- They are no more lawful Paſtor and People, than Whoremonger and Whore going together, and committing acts of filthineſs, and living in Fornication all their days------ Anſ.* Continued Calumny as to me. Is no modeſty or tender fear of ſinning againſt the Ninth Com-

Commandment left? 1. He that refuseth Consent to be a stated Member, is none such: But is he therefore no Christian? Awake, Conscience! Do any Independents say that none are Christians but their special charge; yea, or stated Members of particular Churches? If there be any such, what's that to me? 2. Such persons may be Members of the Universal Church, and I am a Pastor in the Universal Church; and as such may communicate with them. 3. If he desire temporary Communion, he consents to as much as he desireth, and that he may have: If he desire more, he shall have more. § 19. *But* (saith the Accuser) *what speak you of* Literæ Communicatoriæ, *These are nothing to your case*; (he saith it, *ergo*, he proveth it.) *It shuts him out of all particular Churches and Congregations under Heaven, except*, &c.] *Anſ. Putares!* of me it's thus true or false. 1. He that consents not to be a stated Member of any Church, none, because he would be none: and it's blind self-contradiction, to say that I *shut him out*, because *he will not come in*. 2. He that consenteth to be a Member of the *Universal Church* shall not be shut out. 3. He that by *literas Communicatorias*, or any good testimony, sheweth himself a Christian, and desireth onely one days temporary Communion with a stated particular Church, shall not be denied that which *he desireth*, nor will we urge him to more.

§ 19. X V. He adds [*It layeth waste Parish-bounds, leaving people to go to what Church they will* —— *Intimating, that being a godly man and a Parishioner, doth not make him a Member of the Parish-Church* —— *Teaching people to be disorderly.*]

derly.] *Anſ.* 1. *A quatenus ad omne valet conſequentia.* I ſaid enough before to prove the falſhood of your Church-eſtate. 1. Then there were no Church till there were Pariſh-bounds. 2. Then if Papiſts, Anabaptiſts, *&c.* be *godly*, and *dwell* in the *Pariſh*, they are Members againſt their wills. 3. And they are Members of two particular Churches; one in deſpight of them, and of the other as Conſenters. 4. There are ſome Houſes that are in no Pariſh (that I have known). Alas, theſe muſt be of no Church. 5. Some parts of one Pariſh are in the middle of another. The truth is, Pariſh-bounds are ordinarily of good uſe for *Order*, and *Order* is for *Edification*, and to promote the thing ordered: and he layeth it not waſte, 1. That giveth it no more than its due, as a humane mutable circumſtance, and not as eſſential. 2. Nor he that refuſeth it when it is turned againſt the *end* and the *res ordinanda*.

§ 20. XVI. He addes, [*Then if the Paſtor ſet over them be a ſon of* Belial —— *and ſinfully tolerated by the Magiſtrate; the people of the Pariſh who can neither remove him, nor ſit under a more edifying Miniſter, muſt covenant to him*, &c. *Anſ.* Strange! who would have thought but this was neerer your opinon than theirs? Briefly, if the man be *tolerable*, they muſt rather accept of him than have none. If he be *intolerable* in the Miniſtry, they may uſe ſuch common gifts as he hath, (as we read even *a Cicero*) but they muſt be of no particular Church, till they can be ſo on lawful terms. Even a Council of the Popes decreed, that till men can have lawful Paſtors, they muſt forbear that Communion that ſuppoſeth ſuch: And who can doubt of it?

§ 21.

§ 21. XVII. Next, he quibbles onely with a Queſtion [*How long ſhall it laſt?*] *Anſ.* How long will you be of the Pariſh-Prieſts or the Dioceſans Flock, or of a Phyſicians Hoſpital? We cannot ſecure men from providential changes a day, and therefore would not have them to binde themſelves but on ſuch ſuppoſitions — He that means to go to morrow to another Countrey, ſhould conſent but to this days Communion. He that intendeth here to dwell, muſt conſent to the relation of a ſtated Member of that Flock till he remove, or till God ſhew him juſt cauſe to change that relation: till then, he ſhould know his proper Paſtors.

§ 22. XVIII. Next, he queſtioneth, [*Who ſhall degrade them that prove Heretical or Scandalous?* &c.] *Anſ.* The *Ordainers* made him a *Miniſter* by *Inveſtiture*, &c. and yet without our conſent he was not related to us as our Paſtor, or we to him as part of that Church. And ſo we may withdraw our conſent, and become none of his ſpecial Church-flock, and leave it to the *Ordainers* to degrade him if he muſt be *degraded*, as to the world and Church Univerſal. One would think this Anſwer ſhould be undeniable. But he goeth on with his diſmal accuſations, *p.* 116. [*The particular Church-covenant is a thing of mans invention, no where required of God; it is deſtructive to the Church and Souls, ſhould it be practiſed.*] *Anſ.* Seeing Covenanting and known Conſenting are all one with him, what a dreadful damning ſin doth the man make it for to conſent to be under our Paſtors Office? Then he that would eſcape damnation muſt not conſent to the office

of

of the Parish-priest, much less of the Bishop: much less swear obedience to the Bishop: And least of all, say or swear *never to endeavour any alteration.* We have need to bless us from Conformity, if Consenting be so damnable. But what meant he to say [*should it be practised?*] Doth he not know that *it is practised by them all?* and so that this Judge doth damn them all.

§ 23. XIX. He next answereth two of our *pretences.* 1. From the *Election of Ministers* by the people: And saith, *Election is quite another thing; till they are ordained, they are no men in office —— but persons designed —— Answ.* Alas, that the man that hath all this while been damning others, should not see that he hath so damned himself; yea, and quite exceeded my damning error. This it is to print with the zeal described *Jam.* 3. before men know what it is that they talk of. Note, that he is not against the peoples *election* (if he be intelligible) and yet elsewhere [*They are Rebels and no Christians*] that *stand* not to the King and Parliaments election. 2. Note, that he talks of one election, (to the Office of the Ministry as such) and I talk of another election, even to be *our particular Pastor*: For this Physician to be *my Physician.* 3. Note, that the mans bare word must, against all common use and reason, perswade us that *Consent* which I require is more than *Election*, which is much less. The *Elector* nominateth and first *determineth* of the person. *Consent* may come after, even in obedience to the Elector. The King electeth the Bishop, and the Patron the incumbent Parson. Doth every one that after *consenteth* do more? or must we lay by our senses in

in believing such Writers against damning error? 4. Note, that he quite overgoeth the truth on the popular extream, which he accuseth others of: As if the people must elect a man to the indefinite Office of a Minister as such, which is false. Christ sent out his Apostles, and the Apostles sent abroad a converting Church-gathering Ministry without any popular election. The *Ordainers* must chuse who shall be a Minister (by his consent.) The Christian people *should chuse* [and *must consent* at least] who shall be the special Guide of their own Souls; or *their Pastor* in particular. And the Magistrate must chuse, 1. Whom he will maintain and encourage. 2. Whom he will tolerate. How came he to think *that Election is nothing to the case*, as if *Consent* were something more? yet is he at it again, P. 119. [*They make it another Baptism.*]

§ 24. XX. Next, he answereth our saying that [*No man can be a Pastor to a people against their wills.*] And doth he say *Yea*, or *Nay?* Neither plainly, but talks of somewhat else, and saith, [*He is a Pastor by Office and Calling whether the people will or not, and so Pastor and people are not* simul naturâ.] As if the equivocating with the word [*Pastor*] warranted him to damn his Brethren, and confound Church-order: As [*a Pastor*] signifieth but a *Minister commissioned to become the actual undertaking Guide of a particular Church-flock when he is called to it*; so this man may be called a *Pastor aptitudinal*, as a man is a Captain that hath Commission to raise a Troop: But as the word [*Pastor*] signifieth one that is *actually the Overseer of a particular Church-flock*, he

he is none till he have a Flock; and in both ſenſes Paſtor and Flocks are relate and correlate, *& ſimul naturâ*: that is, in the firſt, *ſimul in eſſe cognito & intentionali*: In the later, *in eſſe exiſtente*. But, ſaith he, [*God is God whether the people will or no; and Chriſt is Chriſt, Apoſtles are Apoſtles —— and ſo faithful ordained Miniſters are Paſtors.*] *Anſ.* This is but the fallacy of the foreſaid equivocation of the word [*Paſtor.*] 1. God is not made God, nor Chriſt made Chriſt, nor Apoſtles or indefinite Miniſters ſuch by contract or humane conſent: But he that ſaid, *Come out from amongſt them*, &c. *I will be your God, and you ſhall be my people*, and maketh ſome a *holy Nation and peculiar people*, &c. is *ſo related* to none but *Conſenters*. Chriſt is an *offered Saviour to refuſers*; but he is not the Saviour and Head of any as Chriſtians, or a Church actually, but *Conſenters*: without conſent we are not *materia diſpoſita* receptive of the peculiar relation. A man may be *authorized* to be a Tutor, Schoolmaſter, Phyſician, Captain, Maſter, *&c.* without my conſent: but he is not my *Tutor*, *Maſter*, &c. till I conſent, ſave aptitudinally, not actually. 2. And theſe relations are more dependent on humane Contract or Conſent, than Gods being God, *&c.* But, ſaith he, [*If all be Pagans, the Miniſter lawfully ordained and appointed to convert and baptize and be a Paſtor to them, is a true, full, and compleat Paſtor before he have chriſtened one ſoul of them.*] *Anſ.* True or falſe as the equivocation is taken: As one *decreed* to be a *Husband* to a Wife that is yet unborn, may by the deceiving improper language of an equivocator be ſaid to be the *true, full,*

full and compleat Husband of her yet unborn or unmarried; that is, one *designed* to be a Husband hereafter in a proper sense; so here. But *Pastor dr ovium seu gregis Pastor: Analogium per se positum stat pro significato famosiore.* Heathens are no Church; *Ergo*, no man is a Pastor of them as a Church. Is he a *compleat Pastor* of a *Flock* that hath *none?*

§ 25. XXI. But saith he, [*Mark the matter, you are baptized a godly man; I have nothing against you, onely this, I cannot take you for one of my Flock, unless by a voluntary consent,* &c. *I must shut you out as an Apostate, or a Pagan.*] *Ans. Calumny* and *Deceit* conjunct. 1. It's immodest calumny to say, [*as an Apostate or a Pagan*] I take him for a Christian, and on due testimony shall admit him to such Communion (lawful) as he himself desireth. 1. Whether as a Member of the Universal Church. 2. Or also as a fixed Member of another Church desiring temporary transient Communion here. 2. It is gross *Deceit* to say [*I put him out*] that refuseth to come in. If I give him no more than he is willing of, what do I put him out from? If I take him not for a Member of my proper stated Charge, it is because he desireth it not. I thank God I never was a proper Pastor to any People against their wills, nor ever will be, were I capable of more service.

§ 26. But, saith he, [*This makes against you---Can any man forbid these people from being Members of the Particular Church that are of the Universal?*] *Ans.* Self-contradiction! Do we forbid them that are not willing, or do they forbid

bid themſelves? Doth the Phyſician forbid them to be his Patients that conſent not? Do we ſhut them out that will not come in? Yet he feigneth us to do no leſs *than caſt them out of the Church Univerſal, as caſting them out of all Particulars under Heaven.* *Anſ.* Calumny hath got ſuch a channel, that his Writing runneth commonly that way. 1. I caſt them out of no Church under Heaven, who will not conſent to come in. 2. Were they of no particular Church, they may be in the Univerſal, as I before proved, of many ſorts.

§ 27. He next noteth, that *it is but ſignified Conſent that I require:* But he ſaith, neither Chriſt nor his Apoſtles mention it, and *all the Church are without it.* *Anſ.* Let us trie here whether this be true or falſe, and all his damning and unchriſtning cenſures fall not on the Holy Ghoſt and all the Churches. I. It is certain, that beſides Miniſters unfixed and of general indefinite work, there were by the Holy Ghoſt in the Apoſtles time *fixed Churches* of Neighbour-Chriſtians ſetled. II. It is certain that theſe had *fixed Paſtors* of their own, that were related to them ſpecially as their *ſpecial Charge*, ſo as they were not related to all or any other Churches. III. It is certain that theſe Paſtors had not equal authority to go into all other mens Dioceſſes or Pariſhes, and ſay, You are as much my Charge as any others, and play the Biſhops in other mens Dioceſſes; though when they had a Call, they might be Miniſterial Temporary Helpers. IV. It is certain that theſe Paſtors were ſpecially obliged to many Offices for thoſe peculiar Flocks, which

to

to other Churches they were not ſo obliged to (but onely to occaſional help.) Dr. *Hammond* nameth many of them, and ſo do the Scripture and Canons. 1. A conſtant publick Teaching them, which they owe not to all others or any. 2. Conſtant Government by the Keys. 3. Conſtant Adminiſtration of the Lords Supper. 4. Conſtant leading them in publick Worſhip, Prayer, Praiſe, *&c.* 5. A ſpecial care of the Poor. 6. Ordinary Viſitation of the Sick. 7. Comforting the Afflicted, admoniſhing Offenders, watching over all. The Canons will tell you much, which every man oweth more to his own Charge than to others. V. It is certain that this Flock oweth a more ſpecial attendance, and account, and obedience to theſe Paſtors, than to Strangers or others of other Churches. 1. To hear them. 2. To receive the Communion ordinarily of them. 3. To maintain them; and ſo in the reſt. VI. It is certain that none of this was done or can be done without mutual Conſent. VII. It is certain that this Church-ſtate, Office, and Duty was ſetled by Chriſt's Apoſtles, and continued by the common conſent of the Churches on Earth from age to age.

§ 28. That it was an Apoſtolical Eſtabliſhment is plain in *Acts* 14. 23. *They ordained them Elders in every Church.* To omit the ſence of χειροτονησαντες, which in the moſt uſual ſence includeth Suffrages, it is evident that κατ' ἐκκλησιαν implieth the fixing of the ſeveral Elders to their ſeveral Churches, ſo as to make them the ſtated Elders of thoſe Churches as their Flock in peculiar.

peculiar. *Acts* 20. 17. Are they called the *Elders of that Church over which*, as their Flock, *the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers to feed the Church of God*, to imitate *Paul* that *taught them publickly and from house to house*; and was this no peculiar pastoral relation? or were any but Consenters Members of that Church? *Tit.* 1. 5. when *Titus* was to *ordain Elders in every City*, it is equal to *every Church*. And it stated them as their peculiar Pastors, even Bishops, as *Gods Stewards* over them in particular, *v.* 7. more than others. *Jam.* 5. 14. the sick that must call for *the Elders of the Church*, were their proper Flock, as is supposed. *The Angels of the seven Churches* Rev. 2 and 3. were not equally the Angels of other Churches. *Phil.* 1. 1. the Bishops and Deacons of the Church at *Philippi* had a fixed peculiar relation to them as theirs: *Archippus* had a proper Ministry at *Colosse*, Col. 4. 17. And *Laodicea* had a peculiar Church, *v.* 16. 1 *Thess.* 5. 12, 13. sheweth the common state of the Christian Churches: *Know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them very highly in love for their works sake. And be at peace among your selves.* Here Pastors to *labour*, and *admonish*, and be *over* them, are to be known, owned, esteemed, beloved persons, dwelling among them, and knowing their own Flock, and the peoples duty to them and one another laid down. And shall a Christian Minister say, [*O but do not promise, no nor signifie any consent to do it, for that is to be rebaptized, and is damning to the practisers.*] The Bishops and Elders that *Timothy* is instructed about, were such as had their

their proper Flocks, and took *care of them* as the *Church of God*, that were to *rule them well, and labour* in the *Word and Doctrine*; to *preach the word in season and out of season*, reprove, rebuke, exhort, with all long-suffering and Doctrine, &c. 1 *Pet.* 5. 1, 2, 3. the Elders that *Peter* writeth to were to *feed the Flock of God which was among them*, taking the *oversight* of them (more than of all the world) *not by constrain, but willingly*, (and may they not *signifie willingness?*) not as *Lords, but Examples to their Flocks, and Shepherds under the chief Shepherd.* Heb. 13. 7, 17, 24. fully expresseth it, *Obey them that have the rule over you*; they watch for your Souls as those that must give account, not of all the world, but of that Flock that they oversee. The same Church had Bishops that had Deacons, and some Deaconesses, Widows, &c. but it was never known that Deacons were to be indefinite Overseers of the poor of all Churches, but they had ever relation to particular Churches. This is the *ordering* of the Churches appointed by the *Holy Ghost*, Tit. 1. 5. And yet this man maketh it an abuse or injury against Christ, and overthrow of the Gospel.

§ 29. II. As for the constant judgement and practice of all Churches, I am ashamed that such usage should put me to such a work, as to prove that they ever held and practised that which this man condemneth in me. He knoweth nothing of the Churches state, and History, and Canons, that knoeth not, 1. That all Churches were Societies of Christians united under their proper known Bishops or Pastors, fixed to those Flocks

by proper relation, though also related to the World and the Church Universal. 2. That the people did not onely *Consent*, but *Chuse* their Pastors, and he was to be no Bishop that had not their consent. 3. That the Laity of other Churches promiscuously had no power to chuse them, but onely those whom they were set over. 4. That the Bishops, as *Ignatius* speaks, were to know the particular Members of their Churches, and see that they came constantly to the Assemblies, even to *enquire after Maids and Servants*, saith he, *by name*. 5. That they made multitudes of Canons for exercising particular Discipline on each person that needed it, by long suspending some from Communion, restoring others, taking care of the poor and of all. 6. That they took not the Catechumens for the Church, but Candidates, and prepared and tried them before admittance. 7. That it was not mere baptizing that made them of that Flock; for they preached and baptized in other places. 8. That it was not mere neighbourhood of Christians; for there were sometime divers Churches in one City, as in *Meletius* case at *Alexandria*; and Dr. *Hammond* thinks the Jewish and Gentile Christians at first had several Bishops and Churches in the same Cities ordinarily. And the *Audians*, *Luciferians*, *Donatists*, and others that were of the same Religion, had divers Churches, besides such as the *Novatians*, that had some little Doctrinal differences: and none till now ever thought that these were all the same Pastors special Flocks, and the same particular Churches. Yea, I have elsewhere cited that Council

cil that decreed that if any Bishop neglected to convert the Hereticks, &c. he that converted them should have them (as his Flock or Church.) In a word, all Church-history and Canons describing their particular Churches, and their Elections, Orders, Offices, Priviledges, Discipline, &c. and limiting them that strove for the greatest, from encroaching one on another, tell us so fully that they were so many *incorporate Christian Societies* consisting by *mutual Consent* of their *proper Pastors and Flocks*, that *Et pudet & piget*, that such a task as the proofs should be thus imposed on me by a Minister.

§ 30. The same is still continued, even by the Conformists. 1. The Ministers are even to *swear Obedience* to the *Diocesane*, and the *Diocesane* promise it to the *Arch-Bishop*: And this is a Covenant and more. 2. They are to attend him at Visitations, and otherwise to express their consent to his Government, which they do not to the Bishop of the Neighbour-dioceses. 3. The Parishioners signifie their consent to their Relation to that particular Church and Incumbent, by their constant Attendance, Submission, Communion, &c. 4. The Law and Canon command their *Consent*; yea, to keep their own Parishes, though the Minister preach not at all, suspending Neighbour-ministers that receive such to their Communion that come from such a Reader to them. And the Conformists say that men are bound to obey these Canons.

§ 31. Either Parishioners are supposed thus to signifie Relation-consent to that particular Pastor and Church, or not: If yea, this Accuser

falsly supposeth that *no Churches* but the *Independents* do so. If not, then he giveth up most of their Cause to the Brownists, that say the *Parish-Churches* are none: For it's easie proved that *Non-consenters* are none. Thus rash men confute themselves. Nay we are all silenced for *not Covenanting* to the present frame of Diocesane Churches, and *never to endeavour an alteration*. Yet saith this man [*It is not in any of the Churches, unless Independents, neither explicite nor implicite.*] Then none should so much as implicitely shew Consent to the Relation to his Diocesane or Parish-pastor or Church.

§ 32. But saith he, (to me with gross falsehood) [*Your Covenant is to this effect, you shall not only submit to me as your Pastor, but binde your self by a particular antecedent Covenant so to do: You shall dwell in the Parish, and Covenant so to do, &c.*] *Ans.* I wish, that though design brought the word *Covenant* instead of *Consent* into his mouth, it might not so long stick there as to choak his Conscience, to think that any use of it is lawful. Where and when did I engage any to dwell in the Parish? If they dwell there, I never hindred any from removing. 2. But the *Consent required is beforehand!* very true. The Liturgie bids men come tell the Ministers beforehand that they desire the Communion: Shall I ask them to consent to their duty when it is past? Or can I know who are capable till I know who consenteth? But, saith he, *Why not a Church-Covenant for all other Duties?* *Ans.* Why not a Marriage-covenant to make one a Priest? *&c.* Why not an Oath of Allegiance to make one a Cobler?

Coblar? &c. Consent necessary to the being of a Relation, is one thing; and Consent to every Duty, is another; which yet in general all Christians should promise sincerely to perform. Must we write Books against such things as these?

§ 33. To the Objection, [*I am not bound to take every one that comes into the Parish for one of my Charge:* he hath no better answer than to tell us of Parish-bounds setled by Law, and binding me to do my best for all.] *Ans.* Deceitfully confounding [*Charge*] the *Genus* with [*Church:*] As if Heathens, and Atheists, and Papists, and Refusers are of that *Church*, because I have a Charge to seek their Conversion: Or as if I had no special Charge of that Church. 2. He did not see that he confuteth himself, implying that we *must consent* because of *the Law*. 3. And he forgot the many hundred years before Parish-divisions.

§ 34. His zeal at last thus swelleth [*p.* 129. *I do utterly withstand it, as wickedness and abomination in Gods Church: I am to die and burn at a Stake before I yield to any such thing. You make two Churches, two Church-forms, as two Baptisms---- p.* 130. *to teach Infidelity,---*&c.] Ans. *Let him that thinks he standeth, take heed lest he fall.* Alas! for the Church, whose Guides are no wiser and better men, and tenderer Conscienced than he or I, which ever is in the wrong. 1. You will make me think you are deeply melancholy! Is it so frightful a thing for me to say, *I will be no Pastor to any that consent not*, as to put you into talk of *dying and burning at a Stake?* Had the Mar-

Martyrs been burnt, if men had been of this minde? Did you ever know any put to death or burnt at a Stake for your Opinion? Which is liker to be the burning party! they that say [*We will rule none but Consenters or Volunteers,*] or they that call this *wickedness and abomination*, and so are for the contrary course? Which Party hath killed more for Religion? Reader, you see my *wickedness* and *abomination*.

CHAP. V.

I Had thought to have gone thus over the rest of his Book; but it is such stuff, that my Reason and Conscience bid me spare my own and the Readers time. I. He begins with telling me *what the Church of* England *is*, and all is worse than nothing: Instead of telling me what is the *Constitutive*, *Formal*, *Regent part*, he tells me of Bishops, Pastors, Convocation, King, &c. as if he defined a Man to be one that hath a Head, Eyes, Liver, Stomack, &c. II. It grieveth me to read what he saith of Popery. 1. His Supposition that Popery is sound, if the Particular Church be a part of the Universal, having its subordinate form of Government under Christ's. 2. His Supposition of the Emperour of *Constantinople*'s turning Christian, and becoming the Universal Prince and Bishop of his Empire, as a lawful thing. 3. His Supposition of the Pope's resigning his Place to St. *Peter*, if he were alive, &c. 4. His Note that to claim but St. *Peter*'s

Peter's Place is not to claim Christ's, with more such, are unwise Temptations to Strangers to fear lest *London*-Air have done him hurt. III. His many words about the Princes power to chuse Pastors for all his Subjects, and that if faithful, he is no *Christian that refuseth to accept them.* 1. Is all a bare saying over what he thinketh; taking little or no notice of my Discourse on that subject in my first Plea; where all that's against us is answered before, and I will not repeat it. 2. And it shamefully condemneth his foresaid Condemnations. Is not *Consent* then necessary to the imposed Pastor, if *not consenting Unchristen men?* 3. It supposeth that the political Controversie [*Whether the King be authorized by God to chuse what pastoral Guide all the Subjects shall trust their Souls with?*] (any more than what Tutor, Physician, Wife, Diet, they shall take) is an essential of Christianity, and yet it is not in the Creed, *&c.* When yet it is notorious that all Churches for most Ages since Christ, if not almost all in the world to this day, were and are of the contrary minde, and so are all unchristened by him. 4. And though I urge him, he will not answer what I said of the Question, *Who shall judge whether the Minister be faithful?* 5. If the Patron present a weak ignorant man, that is faithful, but of little use comparatively; and people that feel their need, and regard Eternity, chuse before him such a one as *Hildersham*, *Rogers*, *Dod*, *Preston*, *&c.* he declareth them not onely Sinners, but *Rebels against Christ, and no Christians.* IV. His recitals of the particular Controversies in the end,

end, take ſo little notice of my former Anſwer to him, and do but pour out much of the ſame, that I reſolve hereafter to take as little notice of what he ſhall ſay that ringeth on like a Bell, and hath all Tongue and no Ears. He is full of his *own*, that muſt come out, he cannot ſtop it; and his Oyl increaſeth by pouring out: He is fuller than before, and hath no room for the reception of what he greately needeth.

THERE

There is a Law againſt Lying,

To which we muſt Conform:

OR

Truth pleaded for Peace,

Againſt

The many *Falſhoods* of an un-named *Impleader*; who pretendeth to Anſwer ſeveral Writings of the Author *Richard Baxter.*

CHAP. I.

PREFATORY.

Our Accuſer's Advantages.

§1. I Know when I wrote for *Chriſtianity, the Souls Immortality, againſt Popery, Perjury, Lying, Covenanting againſt Reformation*; and when I wrote againſt *Antinomianiſm, Anabaptiſm, Schiſm,* that all that I had ſo written was eaſily anſwered by Male or Female, at Age or under Age, Learned or Unlearned: For *Nature* and *Parents* teach Mankinde to *talk* betimes, and we have many *Schools* to teach them to read and write: And

And I hear by my Neighbours when they fall out about *Interest* or *Words*, that without a School or University, they can attain to copious fluency pungent Oratory, to describe each other as all that is nought; and prove all so undeniably by vehement asseveration or Oath, that he shall pass for Criminal that will not take their words for demonstration. And what an advantage and improvement would it be to this natural promptitude and fluencie, if one were but *hired* or *engaged* to the work by an Hundred or a Thousand pound a year; yea, and also by the stream and interest of the Army or Sect, in which he is listed by Heart and Hand, and by such necessitating interest of *Reputation* (contrived by the Listers) as that *accusing others* shall seem a necessary diversion of the Charge from himself and of his Conscience from disquieting him, like her that is called *A continual dropping?* But yet if Academical Education should train men up to the degree of *Masters* or *Doctors* of the talking and contending Trade, what an elevation of the faculty would it be? And yet all this is little to the *pondus* of an *inbred enmity* to the *thing* first, and consequently to the *persons*, whom they are to *make* and *prove* intolerable. And there is one that, *unseen*, can prompt and furnish them with materials of all sorts; yea, and help them Subtlety, Vehemency, and most fearless Asseverations. I have heard of a *Cambridge* Doctor of the Chair, that was called, *The certain infallible Doctor*, that was so far from seeming to know what *Doubting* was, that he took him for intolerable that was not of his opinion. And it's like

Bonn

Bonner and *Gardiner* were such, and that it is much of the Roman-Catholick Infallibility: for sure they durst not wrack, burn, and massacre, and ruine all sorts, for that which they did not think themselves certain of; yea, and certainly necessary to the noble ends of Unity, Government, and Peace.

§ 2. To talk it out to the last with these infallible Talkers, is a task for one that hath as *many Tongues* as all they, and is as ready a Linguist, and that is like to overlive them, and that hath no better work to do, and that thinketh that they will read or hear him without the ferment of tumifying impatient Pride: Or else that it is necessary to save the endangered people from seduction, to overtalk the seducers in length and number of words, and that Souls are still unsafe and loose to the truth, as long as there are any to talk against it. I confess, that if you will hive the Swarm aright, it is usually necessary that with a lowder noise you drown the Voice of the Misleader. But I have no such sounding Voice: I am not for the *Celeusma*, Cannons and Guns, with the shouts of the multitude; and that on the higher ground can easily silence me, or drown my Voice. Reason speaketh not so lowd as these.

§ 3. I was lately where it was made a question, Whether Mr. *Kettleby* and such other Booksellers, be not Enemies to their own Trade, by Printing such Books as the *Impleaders*, Mr. *Hinkley*'s, Mr. *Cheyney*'s, &c. "The Affirmer said, "*It would make Books as contemptible as Ballads, "and no body would regard and buy them.* As when

"*News-*

" *News-books* were weighty and credible, most
" bought them; but when beggarly Forgers
" took up the Trade, you may hear the Haw-
" kers cry a Book, a Book, a Book; *News, great*
" *News*, and no body regard them: This there-
" fore will break the Book-sellers at last. The
" Opponent answered, [Set but the Suppositon
" right, and you will see how you confute your
" self. You suppose most men to be wise, than
" which nothing is more false. If you hear not
" Christ and *Paul*, hear *Seneca*'s saying, [*A wise*
" *man must be content of few approvers.*] It is
" the gainfullest way that the Book-sellers could
" have taken: What Books sell better than
" Play-books, Ballads, and Romances, and Books
" of Tales, and Complement, and Jeasts? What
" Book-sellers break faster than those that con-
" fine their Trade to rare Pieces of Antiquity,
" Learning, Reason, and serious Piety? Do
" not men pay dearer for a place in a Play-house,
" than in the Church? And I have oft heard
" some gentile Sons of the Church of *England*
" say, that *they can profit more by a Play than by a*
" *Sermon.* You think that such Books will make
" the Book-sellers-shops, like the *Toy-shops*: And
" what if they do? Will there not be *Children*
" and *indulgent Parents* while the world lasteth?
" What Shops have more trading, or seldomer
" break, than Toy-shops, that sell Babies, and
" Puppets, and Hobby-horses, and Pipes? &c.
" and those that sell Perriwigs, Pide-silks and
" Ribbons? You think that the Book-sellers
" Shops will grow like Ale-houses and Taverns,
" which sober men will rarely visit. And what

" it

"if they do? Let those sober men pass by; Do "such Houses want custome? The Throat will "be the Throat still, and Mirth will be Mirth; "and the lightest Heads shall be the greatest num-"ber.] And this prevailed.

§ 4. I must seriously profess, that I finde in our present Controversie, that my Opponents and *Accusers* have a great advantage of me, and such as I see no great probability to overcome. I mean in the *quality* as well as the number of their Hearers and Readers. 1. Can I expect that men of great Wealth, and Power, and Honour, and who would still fain be greater, should be as willing to believe that those are in the way of *Truth* and *Righteousness* who are by Law judged what we are judged, and adjudged to such Reproach and Punishment; and that go under the Censures, Suspitions, and Contempt, as we have here long done, and are hunted and hid in Jayls with Rogues? 2. Can I expect that men that never were studious or bookish, especially in matters of Divinity and Holiness, but have been bred up in fulness and pleasure, in courtship and converse with such as themselves, who will take him for a Fanatick that doth but talk much and seriously of Heaven, or Scripture, or things Divine, that scarce ever heard what a Nonconformist hath to say for himself, nor ever seriously examined the cause, or read a Book which openeth their case in all their lives. I say, can I expect that such should be able or willing to understand us? I mean, not as if *All were such*; but it hath been my hard hap to meet with few persons, even of Gentile

Education, who ask me, *Why do you not Conform?* that do not presently shew me in Conference, that they are quite out of their Element when they meddle with such matters, and talk of things which they never studied or understood; and indeed do not think it belongeth to them, but to *the Church*: And that is, to *those Church-men* that the *King* and the *Patron* please to chuse; which maketh the Papists say the Laity of the Church of *England* cry down *our believing as the Church believeth, when they do the same by their own Church-men. The Question is but whether it be our Church-men or theirs that are to be believed? And when Kings were on our side, it was our Church-men that were to be believed: and when they are on their side, it is theirs.* And Mr. *Hutchinson*, alias *Berry*, spake harshly when he said in Print, that there was so little of conscionable Religion in the people of the Church of *England*, that if one were but toucht with the Conscience of Religion, he turned Puritan or Papist. I shewed him the injury of his Speech: but I would he had much less occasion for it. Dr. *Stillingfleet* told me, that *there was scarce any of his Hearers or Readers, how mean soever their capacities were, but could discern the weakness of his Evasions.* I dwell near the Verge of his Parish. I have talkt with some of his Auditors, and enquired of many others; and I think verily he is more in the right than I at first believed: For I finde that abundance of his Auditors hear him some once, some twice, some thrice a year, and some of them know not whether Christ be God or man, or both; or whether he had a body

mane Soul, or what a man differs from a Beast; nor what is the true sence of many (if any) Articles of the Creed. And I am perswaded these whom he calleth of *the meanest capacity*, are the likeliest men to discern the *weakness* of My Arguments. I have talked also with divers of his Readers, and I found that they understood this much, that Dr. *Stillingfleet wrote his Sermon against the Nonconformists; and that he is a Dean, and may be greater; and is a man that can talk with any of us*. It may be some that I have not met with know more, as being of a higher Form; and some few I have met with that indeed know more, and those lament the Doctor's undertaking; and when they have read my Answer or Account, confess that they cannot justifie his Charge. Could I but tell how to get *most* of the Church of *England* to know *what Religion is*, and to be *seriously of any Religion*, and to understand *Baptism*, and the *Lords Supper*, the *Creed*, *Lords Prayer*, *and Ten Commandments*; how boldly should I expect their Christian sense and candour in our Cause? But till then, I confess that the Accusers have the advantage of us, and their Books unread will do more than ours.

§ 5. And it is a great advantage which they have got by the *Oxford*-Act of banishing above five Miles from Cities and Corporations all that swear not as is there required. For though the King's Wisdome and Clemency have let down the Floud-gates, and somewhat stopt the *impetus* of the Clergy-stream, yet it was *many years* before Nonconformists durst be *openly seen in Cities*

or Corporations, much less *at Court*, or among *great Men*; and modesty and prudence yet obligeth them to abstain from the presence of their Superiours, where the Law forbids it; so that the Ears of Country-Nobles, and most of our Rulers, hear but what our Accusers say, and have no knowledge of our Cause, but as described by them, whose descriptions are many of them no more credible than if they said that we are Turks.

§ 6. And their Art hath got us to such a straight, that whether we speak or are silent, we are guilty; and whatever we do except swearing, saying, and doing as they require, it shall turn to our Accusation. For instance, Do some think that Dr. *Stillingfleet* is in the right, that *pronounceth Damnation without Repentance against them that prefer not the purest Church*, and thereupon come not to the Parish-Assemblies? Against such they cry out [*Separatists, Schismaticks, preparing for Rebellion; away with them, execute the Laws.*] But if others do as I do, who daily joyn with the Parish-Church in all their Worship, and Communicate in their *Sacrament*, and *oppose Separation*;] Some say [*Such are like Apes that are the ugliest Creatures, though likest unto men while they are not men.*] And others say, [*We know not what to make of Mr. B. he is neither Flesh nor Fish: He is like one that will go one step on one side the Hedge, and another on the other side, to make Uniformity.*] And the men are not altogether mistaken: I profess that I once made it the most earnest action of my life to have prevented the building of a separating Wall, or a dividing

Thom-

Thorny-hedge in the midſt of this part of the Vineyard of Chriſt, to ſeparate one part of the faithful Miniſters and people from the reſt: And that I earneſtly deſire to ſee that Wall or Hedge pull'd down, that Chriſt's Flock among us may be one: And I will do the beſt I can whilſt I live to get it down, that there may be no ſuch ſeparation. And ſeeing this is a work above my power, I will go ſometime on both ſides the Hedge, though by ſo doing I be ſcratcht, and a Thorn in the Fleſh by a buffetting Meſſenger of Satan reprehend me. But reverend Doctors hear my Reaſons: It is not to avoid Uniformity, but Separation. I am a *Catholick*, and not a *Sectary*: I am for Communion with the Univerſal Church: If you will hedge in one corner, and the Anabaptiſts another, and the Separatiſts another; and ſo other Sects that muſt have their peculiars, and turn Chriſt's houſe into your ſeveral Chambers, and his Commonfield into your little Incloſures; and then ſay, Keep onely in our Room, and go into no other; Keep onely in our Incloſure, and go not on the other ſide of the Hedge: I ſhall tell you, that I abhor your ſeparation. I have buſineſs on both ſides: I believe the holy Catholick Church and the Communion of Saints, and not onely your Incloſure, and the Communion of your Conformiſts: I have ſome buſineſs on your ſide the Hedge, the Law and your own expectation will tell you part of it: I ſee ſome of my Fathers Family with you. I have buſineſs on the other ſide the Hedge: There are as good as you; and ſuch as I am neerly related to, and com-

manded to love as my self, and to receive as Christ received us; and not to doubtful disputations, (to prove or approve all your Jurisdictions, Assumptions, Oaths, Covenants, Subscriptions, Reordinations, Formalities and Ceremonies.) Your thorn-hedge hath enclosed but one corner of Christs Vineyard, and I have business in the rest: It hath separated Parents from Children, Husbands from Wives, as to Church-communion, Masters and Servants, Brethren from Brethren, Neighbours from Neighbours: If they that made the hedge can justifie it, let them do it, it will be tryed before a jealous God ere long! if those of you that in learned Books and Sermons exhort us (with somewhat hissing Rhetorick) to separate from those on the other side the hedge, can prove that themselves are all Christs Church, and that God would have us separate from all save them, and give over Preaching and all publick Worship of God, till we can conscionably conform to all their Impositions: I say, if all these silencing Preachers can make good their accusation of the Brethren, and their conclusions, let them that undertake it speed as they perform it: but for my part, I will not separate from Father, Mother, Brother, Friend, and all good Christians save a domineering Sect, because that Sect will else call me *Separatist*. I was wont to draw the Map of the Church Universal as one Body or Field, or Vineyard of Christ, hedged in indeed round about from Infidels, and distributed into thousands of particular Churches, as Streets and Families in one City! But if any will say, Hold Communion with

with one *Street* or *Family*, and ſeparate from the reſt, and then ſay that you are a Schiſmatick for not being for that odious Schiſm; I will hear ſuch, as I do the people that talk through the windows on the weſt ſide of *Moor-fields*, when they ſay that all are *mad* or *Schiſmatical*, that are not in their Cubs and Chains. Mr. *Cheney* was never there I think, and yet it was (*per album an atrum neſcio*) revealed to him that I am downright for an Independant Covenant, which hath twenty Arguments extant to batter it, and prove it guilty of irreligiouſneſs, or ſomewhat worſe: And they ſay (for I am not acquainted much with their practice) that the Independen t bind their flock to hold Communion with none but their own Sect, nor to depart without leave from their particular Churches. I am apt to believe that they are ſlandered (for whoever falls ſick, I will firſt fear the moſt epidemical or common diſeaſe:) but if it be no ſlander, I profeſs that I will never be of a particular Church, which claims to be the univerſal, and will forbid me Communion with all ſave them. And if in this the Prelatiſts agree with the Independents, I am againſt the ſeparating, Sectarian, Schiſmatical preſumption of them both. I take the Kitching and Cole-houſe to be parts of the houſe, and I have ſometimes buſineſs in them both. But I am moſt in my Study and Chamber, and I will take both Chamber and Colehouſe for Schiſm - ticks, if ever I hear either of them ſay, *I am all the houſe*, or [*it is lawful to be in no other room.*] Lord pull up the ſeparating Schiſmatical Thorn-hedge, which hath curſedly divided thy family and flock.

CHAP. II.

The Impleaders Truth examined.

§ 1. CHrist saith, that the *Devil is the Father of Lies*; and doubtless he hath subtilty to excuse them and improve them: and it is a great advantage to them, that they are so disowned by humane nature, that it is taken for an injury to humanity, to charge any man to be a Lyar; and a Ruffian will say it deserveth a challenge or a stab. You will think it a paradox, that natural dislike should be turned to the advantage of a sin. But it is but natural light convincing the understanding, not changing or fortifying the will against it. And therefore it is but pride of reputation and impenitency, that is indeed the fortress of the sin.

§ 2. Accordingly it hath many times been my hard hap, to have such Books written against me, (and that by men whose Reputation is not undervalued by themselves or their followers) as were to be answered chiefly by a *Mentiris* from end to end, if it would not seem by custom to be uncivil. And to tire the Reader by turning a *Mentiris* into a civil long Parenthesis, and this as frequently as gross falshoods are openly said or intimated, is tedious, even when necessary. With one I was put to use my Arithmetick, and to answer him by numbring the *untruths* asser-

ted:

ted: But I have forborn it with others far more guilty, leſt their reverence and power ſhould make truth intolerable, whoſe paſſion or intereſt, or errour, had made groſs Lies ſeem true and neceſſary.

§ 3. This Impleader hath been taught too much by the ſame Maſter; and had he not ſpent part of his Book on Doctrinals, where his *Errata* are but *mendæ*, but been all Hiſtorical where there are too many *Mendacia*, I might have been put to the way of anſwering before-mentioned: But be they *Mendæ* or *Mendacia*, they need *amendment*, and the Reader may need an antidote againſt them.

§ 4. Some beginning we have on the Title-page, [*pretending to ſhew the Reaſons of the ſinfulneſs of Conformity.*] Mend. 1. I pretend in my Plea to ſhew but the *matter* of *Nonconformity*, and *Hiſtorical Narrative* of *our judgment and matters of fact*, paſſing by the *Reaſons* or *Arguments* that muſt prove the things unlawful; though Reaſon may be gathered by the Reader, from the matter or Hiſtory itſelf.

§ 5. The ſame is repeated p. 1. [*He pretends to give Reaſons for the ſinfulneſs of Conformity*, M. 2.] And he overpaſſeth the chief part of my Book, in which I ſtate the caſe of Government and Separation, on pretence that it is [*a dark and dirty way in which I have loſt my ſelf.* M. 3. And a little will ſatisfie him, that regards ſuch an eaſie, dark and dirty anſwer.

§ 6. He *gueſſeth that kneeling at the Sacrament* [*for that was then diſcourſt of*] *was one and the chief of thoſe many heinous ſins of Conformity:*

Mend.

Mend. 4. It seems the man was present. Reader, look to thy belief when thou art among such men. 1. There was not a word spoken then against the lawfulness of *Kneeling at the Sacrament*. 2. I openly declared that I held it lawful, and none of my Brethren contradicted. 3. The thing which we proved unlawful then was, [*Casting those faithful Christians out of the Church-Communion in that Sacrament, who dare not take it kneeling, for the reasons which cause them to think it sinful.*]

§ 7. Impl. [*He will not urge the case, but barely mention matters of fact much less do we here give the reasons of our Cause.*] *He dare not be so bold yet as to venture to displease us. But this Hypocrisie is so thin, that the weakest eye may look through it.*] Mend. 5.

Answ. 1. The Printer put [*urge*] instead of [*argue*] which he was told in the *Errata*. And he maketh the errour his own, by feigning the words to be mine. 2. If I have disputed the Case by *Reasons*, Why did he not cite them, and tell where? 3. He alloweth the Reader to take him for a Calumniator, who will judge the *heart which he knoweth not*, and bring no proof of the hypocrisie, which he saith the *weakest eye may see.* —— Indeed the weakest is liker than the strongest to see as he doth. 4. I will shew him three Reasons, why it is not like to be *Hypocrisie*. 1. Because there are severe Laws against all that shall *deprave* the *Common-Prayer Book*, or accuse Conformity of being sinful, which is Excommunication *ipso facto*, &c. And also Printing such a charge, might

might have coſt both Printer and Writer dear: And the Book was written divers years (as many can witneſs) before the Act that reſtrained the Preſs expired. And is it not credible that every man loveth himſelf, and is unwilling to be ruined? I knew how eaſily you are diſpleaſed, and I felt a little what you can do when you are diſpleaſed, and others felt more. And is it hypocriſie then to ſay, *I feared to diſpleaſe you?* And verily, I was afraid by it of occaſioning your wrath and contentious Writings againſt many others, and making the breach wider, which I deſired to heal.

2. When it's viſible in the Book that I avoid Argumentation, doth not that prove that I ſaid true?

3. The third Proof, if God will, is yet to come: when *you ſee my Arguments* added to the *Hiſtory*, you will confeſs that it was not Hypocriſie to tell you, that I uſed them not before.

§ 8. Impl. [*For whereas the Right Reverend and Learned Biſhop of* Eli *had told Mr.* B. as he confeſſeth——*That he would petition Authority, that they might be compelled to give their Reaſons, he there ſaith,* [*To anſwer the earneſt demand of our Reaſons by you, the Lord Biſhop of* Eli, *I have publiſhed an Hiſtorical Narrative of our Caſe and Judgment.*]

Anſw. Had he not mentioned *weak Eyes*, you might wonder *that he ſaw not how he here* confuteth his own falſhood: when in the words cited I profeſs to give but *the Hiſtorical Narrative of our Caſe and Judgment*, and not the Arguments or Reaſons for it: But he thinketh, [*If the Hiſtory be given in anſwer to him that demanded the Reaſons*

Reasons, then the History containeth those Reasons;] Negatur Sequela: The matter of Fact must go first. The Bishop demanded of me an account of our Non-conformity. This is the beginning of an Answer. The Reasons may come next.

§9. Impl. [*And if he may be believed, they are not only Mr.* Baxter's *Reasons,* (m. 6.) *but of many others* (m. 7.) *for* p. 3. *it is said* [*We that publish this here, give an account of our own judgment, how far we hold it lawful or unlawful to gather or separate from Churches, or to differ from what is established by Authority.*

Answ. The man knoweth not the difference between giving an account of our judgment in *Thesi*, and in *Hypothesi*. If I tell you in what cases I hold it lawful or unlawful to separate from Churches, or how far humane Power may go (as I have done in the second Plea) is that to tell what I take for sin in our Conformity, and the Reasons of it? What if I shew how far Lying is unlawful? Doth that say that Conformity is Lying, &c.

§10. Impl. [*Where is that allowance from Authority, which he pretends to have so long waited for, and begg'd on his knees* (m. 8.) *And where is that care not to displease or provoke the Conformists, by shewing the many heinous sins in their Conformity* (m. 9.) *When without leave of God* (m. 10.) *or man, he not only endeavours to displease* (m. 11.) *but to ruine us.* (m. 12.) *If any thing may be, this is worse than his hypocrisie, it is mere distraction and rage* (m. 13.) *When our common Adversaries the Papists*, &c.

Answ. 1. *It was leave* that I desired, but I never

never said, *I begg'd it on my knees:* but that I would gladly do it, could that prevail.

2. I never shewed the heinous sins of the Conformists, but over and over professed that I accused not them, nor meddled with their case; but only said, How heinous a sin it would be *to us* to Conform, till we knew more reason for it than we do!

3. That it is *without leave of God*, that we give a reason of our not conforming, I take for false, while our Superiours so long and earnestly commanded it, and it is so necessary to abate the dividing *odium* raised against us, Rom. 12. 18. *If it be possible, as much as in you lyeth, live peaceably with all men.*] And if we are taken for *intollerable Malefactors*, is not undeceiving our Accusers and Haters a necessary means of Peace?

4. It's false that an endeavour to undeceive the offended, is an endeavour to *displease* them.

5. And it is more palpably false, that [*I endeavour their ruine.*]

6. How false is it then, that [*this is distraction and rage?*] And what more necessary to unite us against the common Adversaries? What Physicians hath this poor Nation, that know no way to unite us, but laying us in Jails with Rogues, till we can believe all to be lawful which they impose?

Reader, Pitty the case of this poor Land! What hands are we fallen into? What false Doctrine is charged on us? What is the Crime that we have committed? We are forbidden to Preach Christ's Gospel, though we were solemnly devoted to it by Ordination, under the Penalties

Penalties of great Mulcts, and Impriſonments, and ruine, till we will do that which after our beſt enquiry we verily judge would be our heinous ſin. We forbear many years to tell them ſo much as what it is which we dare not to do; till at laſt, the Biſhops themſelves tell us, *They will petition Authority to conſtrein us to it:* And Parliament-men long askt us, *What is that you ſtick at?* And when after about ſeventeen or eighteen years Silence, I do but tell them *what it is*, the Clergy-men are ſo diſpleaſed, that they tell me, that *It is diſtraction, and rage, and an endeavour to ruine them.* When I never moved to put one Prieſt of them out of his Benefice, nor Biſhop, Dean, Archdeacon, Canon, Prebend, out of a Farthing of his maintenance, nor one Biſhop from their Lordſhips, or Parliament-Power; much leſs did I ever motion the ſilencing of any one of them, or making them pay Fourty Pound a Sermon, or laying them in Jayl, as we are uſed; and yet they cry out, that *we endeavour to ruine them.* The Lord pity his poor Flock! What a caſe are we in, when our Paſtors ſeem to think, *that they are ruined*, if we be but ſuffered to Preach Chriſt's Goſpel, and to live out of a Jayl: and think that if we offer to refel the Slanders that render us odious to them, and do but ſpeak for our Miniſtry and Liberties, as every Malefactor is allowed by the Judges to ſpeak for himſelf, we ſeek the ruine of our Clergy-Accuſers? Do not Heathens abhor ſuch Injuſtice as this?

My Purſe is leſs to me than my Miniſtry; and all that any man can take from me, will be much

much leſs than Fourty Pound a Sermon: And yet if any men on the High-way, or in my Houſe, ſhould not only take away all that I had, but afterward prefer a Bill againſt me, as *ſeeking their ruine*, becauſe by Reaſon I intreated them to forbear, and that in vain, it would be one of the oddeſt Caſes that hath come into *Weſtminſter*-Hall. I was once neighbour to a valiant Knight, who yet was ſo gentle, that when the Hookers in a Moonſhine-night were hooking his Cloaths and Goods through the window, and he lay in Bed and ſaw them, he lay ſtill, and mildly told them, *Gentlemen, This is not well done, Theſe things are not yours; If you are taken, you may be hanged for it.* And by that time his Sermon to them was done, they had got what they came for, and were gone. But I never heard that they entred a Suit againſt him, for *ſeeking to ruine their Trade* by his reprehenſion. But if any of you have ſuch a trade, as will not endure the Plea of innocent Sufferers for Peace or Mercy, without your ruine, I would ſome one that you have more regard for, would perſwade you quickly to lay by that trade, leſt when Chriſt is Judge, and ſaith, *Inaſmuch as you did it to one of the leaſt of theſe, you did it to me*, your *Clergy* will not ſave you from his Sentence; were it but the devouring of Widows houſes, it is not the longeſt Liturgy that will excuſe you by *a Legit*; nor will you eſcape with Burning in the Hand, unleſs Repentance now prevent it. The evil Servant that ſtuffs his guts, and beats his Fellows, preſuming on his Lords delay, you know is threatned with a ſharper penalty.

§ 11. Impl.

§ 11. Impl. p. 4. *No perſon of any Note, that I have heard of, in all that Party who were in places of Truſt and Publick Employment, did on the late Teſt refuſe to communicate with the Church of* England.

Anſw. 1. How far doth your hearing reach? 2. How many of that Party have you known in ſuch places of Truſt? I ſuppoſe you know, when the Teſt in the Corporation-Act was impoſed, that Party were then turned out of all Corporation-power? In ſome places not two of the old ſtaid in: And is it any wonder then, if none of that Party be in ſuch Power? 3. And is Communicating in the Lords Supper all the Conformity that is ſcrupled? And what's all this to our Controverſie?

§ 12. Impl. [*When all our United ſtrength is too little to withſtand the attempts of our common Adverſaries; it is a wonder to me, with what Confidence and what Deſigne he ſhould not only proclaim Conformity on the Miniſters part to be impoſſible, but endeavour alſo with all his might to withdraw the* Laity *from our Communion.*] m. 14.

Anſw. 1. Is it a Truth, that one that holdeth Communion with your Church, and ſpeaketh and writeth for it, and diſſwadeth none from it, doth *endeavour with all his might to withdraw the Laity from it?* Can you not forbear this ill cuſtome a few Lines together?

2. *Ex ore tuo:* See, Reader, the man confeſſes the need of our *United ſtrength.* Hold him to that word: And I repeat, If he and the reſt of that Tribe do believe, that it was *morally poſſible* that the two Thouſand Silenc'd Miniſters, and all

all that came after them, ſhould believe all the things which I named in my *Plea for Peace*, and all the reſt which many ſcruple, are lawful for them to do; I wonder not at any Confuſion, Calamity or Corruption that ſhall befal a Church that is conducted by ſuch men! Who would have thought that there had been ſuch men among Chriſtians, and Paſtors of a Reformed Church? But I do not believe that there are many ſuch, that think it morally poſſible that we ſhould all believe all Conformity lawful; they would never elſe have truſted ſo much to Mulcts and Jails, as to think their Church undone without thoſe Helps. They are not ſuch ſtrangers to Sence and Conſcience: It is the wearing out of the preſent Generation of Non-Conformiſts, and alluring or affrighting Youth from following them, which the men of any Brains have truſted to.

Judge by theſe Evidences of this mans Wit and wondering. 1. By the *great number* of the things which we judge ſinful: They might diſpute men into their Opinion in ſome *few differences*, that cannot in ſo many. 2. The Sins feared are ſo *heynous*, as that Conſcience will not quickly univerſally ſwallow them. 3. The number of the *Diſſenters*: To diſpute a few men out of their Judgments in difficult caſes proveth hard, much more many hundreds or thouſands. 4. Conſider the *quality* of the ſilenced Miniſters: Could they think that ſuch men as *Anthony Burges*, *Sam. Hilderſham*, Mr. *Hughes*, Dr. *Manton*, Dr. *Seaman*, &c. did not conſider what they did, neither in their Health, nor before their Death?

Did they never read or hear what might be said for the New-Conformity? Had they not Learning or Wit enough to understand it? Or had they no Conscience living or dying? So many hundreds that after their best enquiries, and hearing all, remain Non-Conformists, are unlike to be all brought to Conform. 5. Judge by old experience: Were old *Hildersham*, *Ames*, *Dod*, and hundreds like them, brought to Conformity heretofore? Mr. *Sprint*, Dr. *Burges* and some others were, but more were not. Did not even the *Westminster*-Assembly of old Conformists forsake it assoon as they could? 6. Judge by the change of the Case, and the Writings even of the old Conformists: Such things are put into the New-Conformity, as *Bilson*, *Hooker*, *Usher*, and other old Conformists have written against. And would they also repent and change their minds, if they were alive? I again profess, that I am bound in Charity and Reason fully to conclude, that had *Usher*, *Bilson*, *Hooker*, *Jewel*, *Preston*, *Sibbes*, *Whately*, *Bolton*, and all such, yea Dr. *Jo. Burges*, *Sprint*, and such others of their minde that writ for the old Conformity bin alive, they would all have bin Nonconformists to our new Impositions. 7. Judge by the *means that are used* to convince us: Is there any thing said that hath such cogent Evidence as to convert so many hundred men to your Opinions? Did such men as Dr. *Twisse*, Mr. *Herle*, Mr. *Gataker*, Mr. *Vines*, &c. want the Instruction of our present Lords, to make them wise enough to Conform? When I know none of the Conformists writings that have so much as named some of

of the things that we think worſt of. 8. Judge by preſent Experience: Why is it not done, if it be morally poſſible? Have you not had near twenty years Trial, by your Reaſonings, Preachings, Writings, Reproaches, Allurements, Threatnings, Canons, Fines, Jails, Informers, crying out for execution of the Laws, &c. and is it yet done? Have there not ſince more (of the Laity) turned from you, than have turned to you? Will not Experience convince you? 9. Judge by the great diverſity of mens conditions and capacities, which I have elſewhere opened. Will ever men of ſuch different Capacities, Educations, &c. agree in ſuch and ſo many things? 10. Judge by the requiſites to ſuch a Concord. It muſt be by bringing all the Miniſtry to a higher degree of *Knowledge*, or *Conſcience* and *Honeſty* than all the Nonconformiſts. For it can be nothing that you think keeps us from Conforming, but *Ignorance* or *Badneſs*. (Dr. *Aſheton* undertaketh, as going to the bar of God, to prove that it is *Pride* and *Covetouſneſs*) And how can you hope to make us all ſo much *Wiſer* and *Better* than we are? Do you believe that the ſeven Thouſand that had Conformed to the Directory, and ſtaid in by Conforming to your Law, 1662. were ſo much *Wiſer* and *Better* than the two thouſand that were caſt out? Or that the greater part of your Countrey-Prieſts now (if the lamenting people wrong them not) do Conform, becauſe they *know more*, or are *Better men* than we? If it be ſo, he is unworthy to be a Paſtor, that knoweth not how hard a matter it is to make all the Miniſters of a Nation ſo much

wiser and *better*. He is blinde that seeth not, that it is Fines, Jails and Death, that our Prosecutors trust to. And will true Conscience be convinced by such Arguments? Would you your selves change your minds in Religion, if you were but Fined and Imprisoned? If so, you are men of no true Religion: If not, why expect you it from us?

§ 13. But what am I doing? Will it not more tire than profit the Reader, if I should number abundance more of his Untruths? I will step to his *concluding Farewel* to me, and then see how he justifieth the trade, by pleading for Equivocation, Pag. 128. [*You gave several intimations that the King was Popishly affected, as Bishop* Bramhal *affirms,*] Mend. 15.

Answ. Why did not the man tell where and when? I have Printed the contrary in the time of highest Usurpation, that the King was no Papist. Is he not a Calumniator, unless he prove it? But he saith [*Bishop* Bramhal *affirms it.*] *Answ.* A man that never saw me: why did he not cite Bishop *Bramhal*'s proof? But see what this sort of men are come to! Do they think it enough to warrant their slanders of us, because one of their Archbishops hath slandered us before them? What Credit then is to be given to such mens History or Reports? Is this it in which the Authority of Archbishops consisteth, that they must be followed in slanders? No: It is not their Obedience to Archbishops, but their Conformity to a calumniating Spirit: For *Bramhal*'s Predecessor, Arch-Bishop *Usher* (a man honoured by all good men that knew him,

for

for Learning, Piety, and Honesty) was of no such Authority with them; but we are scorned for conforming to his Judgment. But you see that a Calumniator with you is no singular person. They are not ashamed to tell the world, that their Archbishops lead them, and are as bad as they.

§ 14. Impl. p. 128. [*You applauded the grand Regicide, as one that prudently, piously and faithfully, to his immortal Honour, did exercise the Government.*] Mend. magn. *16.*

Answ. Reader, Do not wrong this man so much, as to think he is the Father of this. He taketh it up but in *Conformity* to his Fathers and Brethren that have oft printed it before him: and he must *keep* company and be Conformable. Alas! It is not one or two such men as are the Guides of Souls in *England*: But what? Had he no pretence for it? Yes, more than for many of the rest. He that undertook to be a Lying Spirit in the mouth of all *Ahab*'s Prophets, never undertook to deceive them without any pretence. I have somewhat else to do than to write the History of my actions in those Times, as oft as any such man will tell such a Story as this.

In short, I thought then that both sides were faulty for beginning the War; but I thought the *Bonum Publicum*, or *Salus Populi*, made it my Duty to be for the Parliament, as Defensive against Delinquents, and as they profest to be *only for King, Law and Kingdom*: When at the *New Moddle* they left out [*for the King*] and changed their Cause, I changed from them, and was

sent by two Assemblies of Divines to do my best though to my utmost labour and hazard, to dissuade them. *Cromwel* having notice of it, would never let me once come near him or the Head-Quarters. I continued on all occasions publickly and privately to declare my judgment against him as a rebellious Usurper till he died. But being at *London* a year or two before he died, the Lord *Broghil* (since Earl of *Orery*) would needs bring me to him; where I dealt so plainly with him, in demanding by what Right, against the Will of almost all the Kingdom, he pull'd down our lawful *English* Monarchy that we were sworn to, and the Parliament, as cast him into such Passion, as broke out in reviling many of the worthiest Parliament-men, that he knew me to be familiar with. The last time the Earl of *Orery* saw me, he told me, he had told the King of that Conference, and that he should love me the better while he lived, for my Faithfulness. He and *Lambert* and *Thurloe* were (silently) present. A Twelvemonth after, Sir *Francis Neuberfole* would needs dispute me into Repentance for being for the Parliaments Cause, by way of Writing: I told him, that the sad effects were enough to make us all suspicious; but I would give him those Reasons that had moved me, with a true desire to know the full truth, that if I had erred, I might not remain through Ignorance without Repentance: He wrote to me, that in the mean time, seeing I was satisfied against *Cromwels* Usurpation, I should go to *London* to set it upon his Conscience to perswade him to restore our present King: I sent him word,

word, that as he took me for his Adversary, so his Conscience was not so easily perswaded to give up such a prey; and that this was not now to do; I had been lately with him, and I and others had tried such perswasions, or the like, in vain. While I was preparing my Papers for Sir *Francis Nethersole*, cometh out Mr. *Harrington*'s *Oceana*, contriving the Settlement of a *Democracy*, which they called *a Commonwealth*; and Sir *H. Vane* was about another Model: I wrote somewhat against them, and Mr. *Harrington* printed a Paper of Gibberish, scorning at my Ignorance in Politicks: Against him I wrote my Political Aphorisms, called *A Holy Commonwealth*, in the beginning pleading for the Divine Universal Soveraignty, and next for Monarchy as under God; and next (seeing they were all on New Modelling) I told them, how Piety might be secured and promoted by Monarchy; and to get Sir *Francis Nethersoles* Answer for my fuller satisfaction, I added as to him, as I promised, the reasons that had moved me to be for the Parliament. While I had purposed the later part first, *Oliver* died, and his Son *Richard* was set up while I was writing the Book: Before I had finish'd it, the Army had pull'd down first his Parliament, and next *Richard* himself; I never had known a Parliament more enclined to Piety and Peace. My deep displeasure against the Madness of the Army, that had rebelliously pull'd down all Power, King, Parliaments, and at last him whom they set up themselves, drew me first to write the sad Meditations in the end, and then a sharp Preface to the Army against their

their Rebellions: In which I aggravated their Crime in the last instance among the rest, in putting down suddenly *Richard* their Protector, whom they had lately Courted and Set up: and I used these words, [*It was written while the Lord Protector (prudently, piously, faithfully, to his immortal Honour, how ill soever you have used him) did exercise the Government,*] &c. Now so congruous are these mens Principles and Practice, that they fear not to tell the world in Print, and that successively from one another, that I [said this *of the grand Regicide*] Oliver, whom I so openly and so deerly opposed: And a *putarem*, or a *non putarem*, will excuse a Volume of such tricks, if the cheat or falsehood be discovered. They might easily have seen by the whole scope of that Preface, that it was *Richard*, and not *Oliver*, that I spake of. It was not *Oliver* that they *misused and pulled down*. And I praised him, to shew the evil of their Rebellious Proceedings. It was not *Taking the Government*, which he had no Right to, which I praised; but his short *Exercise*: And I thought him praise-worthy on many accounts.

1. He never meddled in any War against the King, notwithstanding all his Fathers Interest and Power, but was suspected to be for the King. 2. We never heard that he sought or expected the Government, but it was thrust upon him. 3. When he was offered help presently to apprehend them that suppress him; he refused it, and renounced the Government at a word, resolving not to shed a drop of blood to keep that which was so thrust upon him.

4. He

4. He ſet himſelf by a Parliament of pious peaceable men, to have ſuppreſt Hereſie and Confuſion, and to have reſtored Order, and Equity, and Peace. 5. The Kings chief Friends about us told me, that *Richard* was for the King, and that ſome were Treating with him to Reſtore him: Though I confeſs, I hardly believed that his Self-denial was ſo great. I thought all this had ſo much laudable, as to aggravate the madneſs of that Army, who when they had deſtroyed the King, and pulled down the Parliament, did alſo put down him whom they had Set up and Sworn Fidelity to themſelves. His want of Right did not juſtifie their Perfidiouſneſs. Thus the Conformiſt grounds his Accuſation.

§ 15. Impl. *p.* 128. He repeateth a Leaf of my own words to Mr. *Bagſhaw*, againſt the Armies Rebellion againſt King and Parliament, and ſetting up the Protector, and the reſt of their Injuries; not ſeeing that he confuteth his own Calumny, while to prove that *I am for thoſe actions*, he proveth that I have condemned them as heinous ſin: See here how ſtrongly theſe men argue!

§ 16. Impl. *p.* 131. [*His applauding the firſt Bonfeſcu, as glorious Saints in Heaven, his vindicating the Authority and War of the Parliament againſt the King, his pertinacious adhering to the Covenant, crying down the Royal Martyr as a Papiſt, after he had ſealed the ſincerity of his heart to the Reformed Religion with his Blood; and the crying up his Murtherer for a prudent, pious and faithful Governour: His Principles in his Holy Commun-*

Commonwealth, and his present practices in defending Schism, and so sowing Sedition, &c. *Cry aloud for Repentance and Retraction*, &c.]

Answ. Here are his Doctrinal Principles exemplified: He hath now got the art of linking and condensing falshoods so close, that I must cease numbring them, while one is made up of so many.

1. The first Accusation went before, *p.* 88, 89. where he mentions *Brooke*, *Pym*, *Hampden* and *White*, &c. saying, [*What if they are gone to another place?* —*You were ashamed to continue them in your* (Book) *being left out in your last Editions.*

Answ. 1. I left them out, because the Book could not be Licensed else: And should I not rather leave out a few Names, than cast away the whole Book? Had I done it in Repentance or to please such as you, you tell me how it would have been taken.

2. I never spake with one of them; but I have heard so credible testimony of their conversation, especially of *Hampden* and *White*, that I am far more confident that they are in Heaven than that such as you will ever come thither. Impartial men of both sides honoured them; I heard an antient grave Gentleman, that was no Phanatick, nor accounted a Puritan, but a sober honest man, say, 1644. [*If I might choose what person in all the world I would be, I would be* John Hampden.]

3. It is not only Bishop *Jer. Tailor*, but Politicians commonly that acknowledge, that *It hath not pleased God to make Politick Cases of the de-*

gra-

grees and forms of Power so easie to us, as that all good Christians can decide the Controversies about them. It's commonly agreed, that God hath not forbidden Monarchy, Aristocracy, Democracy, or Mixt Government; nor made only one of these to be lawful. And it is past Controversie then, that it is *National Fundamental constituting Contracts, Laws or Customs*, and not any *expresse Scripture*, that must tell us *de facto & jure*, what is the *Species* of each Countreys Government. It is not in the Creed, Lords-Prayer, Decalogue, or Sacraments: Therefore the knowledge of it is not of absolute Necessity to Salvation: I finde it not in the condition of the Covenant of Grace. Methinks they that say Heathens may be saved, should grant it of Christians that know not when a sinful division falls out between King and Parliament (and that with many difficult circumstances) which it is that should be then obeyed or defended. Christ was drawn by Hypocrites to pay Tribute to *Cæsar*, rather than offend; but he would not be drawn to justifie his Dominion over the Jews. *Paul* commands Obedience to the *Higher Powers* as of God, and as watching for our good: But he would not be drawn to declare, Whether it was *Cæsar* or the Senate which was the Higher Power, when they came to be divided in their Commands.

4. I have produced too large Testimony from Antiquity, how ordinarily the Bishops of East and West too quickly owned and praised the Usurpers of the Empire, when once in possession: Not only the Synods in *Martins* time that owned *Maximus*, but *Ambrose* and *Theopl. Alexand.*

and. to *Eugenius*, and *Gregory* the first, and many Western Bishops, and ordinarily far most of the Eastern Bishops presently owned Usurpers, that came into the Empire by the Murder or Deposition of their Predecessors. And are all these Fathers and Christians damn'd ?

5. The Liturgie requires that when such are Buried, they are openly pronounced saved ; that is, *That God of his great Mercy hath taken to himself their Souls out of the miseries of this Life, and that we hope to be with them :* We must be Silenced and Imprisoned if we will not say this, and subscribe to it, and reproached if we do : This is the Conformity which they would have us yield.

6. Do you not tremble your self, when you question whether they be not gone to a worse place and revile us for the hopes of their Salvation? Doth not your Conscience ask, If such men be not saved, what will become of me, that deliberately write such Volumes of Fallhoods against God's true Servants, and their present serving him, as if they must cease Preaching and all Church-worship, till they dare Conform to all imposed ? O why will you condemn your self in others !

7. I finde many of your selves honouring Bishop *Jewel*, Bishop *Bilson*, and Mr. *Hooker*, and such others that held the Principles which those men went upon ; and you never yet, that I heard of, reviled any man for hoping that they were saved : No nor *Grotius*, nor *Barclay*, nor the common sort of Lawyers, and Politick-Writers, that have said more of the Cases in which Kings may

may be Reſiſted and Depoſed, than they did, or than I ever ſaid. If ſuch Principles may ſtand with the Salvation of *Grotius*, *Hooker*, *Bilſon*, *Althuſius*, *Alſtedius*, *Willius*, &c. Why not of theirs that I have mentioned?

8. You know, I ſuppoſe, that it was moſtly Epiſcopal men that began the War; Lords, Commons, and Souldiers on both ſides. (If you *will* not *know*, and can be ignorant when you liſt, your Will hath a freedom which mine hath not.) And are you ſure that your Conformiſts alſo are damned?

9. You hereby teach them that are confident that the *Laudian Clergie* were the chief Cauſers of the War, to conclude therefore that they are damned. And ſo our Clergy on both ſides will be like *Gregory* the Seventh's and the Emperour's in *Germany*, firſt exciting and encouraging the Princes and People of the two ſides, and then taking Oaths againſt each other, and laſtly damning one another; till a Reverend Council of Biſhops Decreed, that all the Biſhops on the Emperours ſide ſhould be Depoſed, and the Dead digg'd out of their Graves and burnt.

10. You will open the eyes of the people to ſee what manner of Spirit you are of, and that it is no wonder if you cannot endure us to Preach and Live by you; who take us for Criminal for hoping that men are ſaved, who otherwiſe were of moſt exemplary Lives; but being in point of Politiques on the Parliaments ſide, and doing accordingly, while they profeſſed to arm only againſt Subjects, holding the perſon of the King to be inviolable. I finde not that even in the

Baron-

Barons Wars, or the Wars between the Houses of *Lancaster* and *York*, no nor King *Stephens*, the Censures were so high. *Anselme* Archbishop of *Canterbury* is Sainted, that was against his King.

§ 17. The second Charge is, my *Vindicating the Parliaments War against the King*.]

Answ. 1. I believed then that it was not against him, when their Commissions were for him. 2. I proposed my Reasons upon a Learned Knights demand, requesting satisfaction by an Answer: And had you or any of you ever since confuted them, it had been more charity than only to Recite them and Condemn them. But I have over and over publickly declared my revocation of that whole Book, (though not of all that's in it) and wisht that I had never written it, for more Reasons than I will now name to you. 3. My Judgment about the King's Power, and our Obedience, I have fully declared in *The Second Plea for Peace*.

§ 18. The third Accusation is, [*His pertinacious adhering to the Covenant.*]

Answ. 1. The man knoweth that I own not the imposing it, specially as a Test for the Nations Concord, it being an engine of Division so imposed. 2. That I own not the taking it so imposed. 3. That I deny that it obligeth me to any thing that is evil, yea or from any Obedience to the King in things lawful, nor to any thing but what I have a former obligation to from God himself. 4. But I confess that I dare not say, that it obligeth no man to repent of his Sin, nor to be against Popery, Prophaneness or

Schism,

Schism, nor to endeavour any amendment of Church-Government. And I will not deny, but that I take Perjury to be no indifferent thing; which of these is the Crime of Adherence, he tells me not.

19. The next Accusation is, [*Crying down the Royal Martyr as a Papist.*]

Answ. I have said, Till he tell me where, and how he proveth it, I must take him for a gross Calumniator, and wonder not that he Conformeth. In my *Key for Catholicks* he may see where I prove the contrary, that the King was no Papist. I will confess that which he knoweth not: 1662, and 1663. when the Kings Letter in *Spain* to the Pope was Printed out of Mr. *de Chesne* by *Prynne*, I was struck a while with doubt and suspicion; But I soon considered, 1. That the words promised but Endeavours for Unity. 2. And that it was written in the *Spaniards* power, in a streight.

§ 20. The next is, [*Crying up his Murderer.*]

Answ. A repeated malicious falshood.

§ 21. The next Accusation is, [*His Principles in his Holy Commonwealth.*]

Answ. 1. I oft told you, *The Book is revoked long ago.* 2. The Principles which I own I have published as aforesaid in the *Third* Plea: and he doth not confute them. 3. Of the Wars I spake before: What other doth he name? Bishop *Morley* recited many of them; and the *first* as I remember was, that I say, [*That pretence to unlimited Monarchy is unlawful, or Tyranny, because God hath Limited all Humane Power.*] If this be Heresie or Disloyalty, I hold it still: I mistake much, if any

any Kings have Power from God to command all their Subjects to blaſpheme or deny God or Chriſt, or to renounce his hope of Heaven, or to worſhip the Devil, and ſell his Soul to him, nor to murder Father, Mother, Wife or Children. I will venture to diſpute this with any Conformiſt. But as to the harder queſtion, Whether Kings may kill any or all their Senators or innocent Subjects for nothing, or burn all their Cities, or take all their Wives, Children and Eſtates, I will leave it to Stateſmen to debate. I am ſorry that ever I wrote ſo much about their matters.

§ 22. The next charge is, [*His preſent practices in defending Schiſm.*]

Anſw. Prove it, or number it with your Slanders. What is the Schiſm? Is it Schiſm to ſay, *That it is unlawful like Atheiſts to ceaſe all Publick Worſhip of God, till Conſcience can find it lawful to Conform?* Others think that the contrary is both Schiſmatical and Atheiſtical. Can you prove that I am for Silencing faithful Miniſters, and making partition ſeparating hedges in the Vineyard of Chriſt? My Rule is, to go no further from any Chriſtian than he goeth from Chriſt, or would force me to ſin for his Communion.

§ 23. The next charge is, *Sedition*; that is, not giving over God's Worſhip, till I can ſwear, ſay and do all that is impoſed. Where is the proof of all theſe Accuſations? But their method of Juſtice is, firſt to do execution (caſting out 2000) and next to juſtifie it by an Accuſation behinde our backs, and next to bring their

their Witneſſes, when we are dead or forbidden to ſpeak; and they are one anothers Witneſſes. This mans proof is, that Biſhop *Bramhall* of *Ireland* ſaid it: The next mans may be, that *This* man ſaid it: Dr. *Aſhetons* proof was, that the *Debate-maker* ſaid it; and who ſaid it to him I know not.

And p. 100. This man hath an infallible witneſs, Biſhop *Morley* then of *Worceſter*. And what ſaith he? Why firſt, *That I did what I could to make the King odious to his people.* But where's his proof? It's enough; The Biſhop ſaid it. 2. *I ſowed the ſeeds of Sedition at* Kederminſter: The proof is the ſame; the Biſhop ſaid it. 3. The Biſhop taught him to adde, [*I my ſelf have heard him, in a Conference in the* Savoy, *maintain ſuch a Poſition, as was deſtructive to the Legiſlative Power of God and man.*] But what if the Biſhop ſpake as falſely, as if he had ſaid that I pleaded for *Mahomet?* Where is your proof then? I after Printed the words with the Diſpute of the Dr's, to which they were an Anſwer: And I have in my Second Plea, in a Diſputation of Scandal, vindicated them. Let any man of brains read both, and believe the Biſhop and you if he can. But, Reader, if ſuch mens renewed Accuſations cauſe me yet to Print that Anſwer to the Biſhop's Letter, which for peace I caſt away; blame not me, but them that force me to it: I am for peace, but they are for War.

§ 24. But what good will it do the Reader, to have this mans Falſhoods detected and numbred?

bred? They are so many and so gross, that it is a troublesome work; as p. 107. [*Your Principles which assert, that the King may be Deposed.*]

Answ. Burn any Book of mine with scorn, where I ever asserted any such thing: But if it be a Forgery, believe such men accordingly.

So p. 112. [*Refusing the Tests of Obedience, which require only the disclaiming of Rebellious Principles and Practices.*] *Answ.* See my Profession and Renunciation, second Plea, Chap. 3. and my Confutation of *Hooker*, Chr. Direct. Par. 4.

Pag. 112, 113. He joyns with those that would bring us into the Plot, and fathers his Accusation on the Acts of Parliament against us.

Pag. 113. He saith, I have [*a better opinion of the Papists, than of the Conformists,*] because I say, *I had rather be saved from the Gallows by a Papist, than hang'd by a Conformist.*

So p. 132. [*To withdraw your avowed Communion*] *Answ.* A Fiction: witness the Parish-Assembly.

Pag. 133. *Your Practice continueth and encourageth Separation from our Communion.*] False.

Ibid. Cartwright, *after he had written as much as he could against Conformity, repented and Conformed at last.*]

Answ. A Fiction: No more than I Conform. Many a time have I been in *Warwick*, where he last lived Master of the Hospital, and the antient people there and at *Coventry* knew the contrary. If to joyn in the Liturgy and Sacrament (and perhaps

perhaps rather than be Silenced, to wear the Surplice) be Conforming, you abuse many whom you reproach and silence as Nonconformists.

Pag. 134. He mentions my *Positive opposing and hindering their Communion.* The Book is much made up of such untruths in matter of Fact.

§ 25. His Postscript is his *Ingenuous Conjectures, if not Proofs, that I am a Liar and an Hypocrite, in the dating of my Prognostication; and that it was written* 1680. *Answ.* Should I abuse the Reader by a particular Answer to them? That it was not written 1680, many persons that saw them can witness. Will his Reasonings make me ignorant of such a matter of my own fact? All that I know of it is this, 1. As far as I can remember, it was shortly after the *Savoy*-Conference, that the first Copy was written; but just the Month I do not remember. 2. Finding this Copy among my rude neglected Papers, I wrote it fair in 1671. And my Memory is not so strong, as to be sure that I altered not a word: For I cast away the first rude Copy. 3. After that, I thought it had been lost, not seeing it some years: Till Mr. *Matthew Silvester* told me, that I had long ago lent it him to read: I did not think it worth the Publishing. But one of judgment that he shewed it to, thinking otherwise, I added a few Lines in the End: This is the Truth, and if it be the Impleaders interest to believe it to be false, let him use his Intellect and Pen accordingly, I'le no more strive against him.

CHAP. III.

His Answer to the first Plea for Peace Examined.

§ 1. BEcause the great Charge against the Non-Conformists is, 1. *Their Not Conforming.* 2. And *that till they can Conform they cease not Preaching and all publick Worship of God (which is to live like Atheists, and chuse Damnation.)* The first thing that I did in my *First Plea*, was to *Declare our Judgment about Churches, Ministry, Church-Communion and Separation*, (in what Cases we hold it *sinful or lawful.*) To my great wonder, almost all this is past over by all my *Accusing Answerers* that I have seen, as if it had bin little to them. And they go on to take it for granted, that we are guilty of Schism and sinful Separation, or else wondering that we do not grant it. 2. And as to the second part of our Charge, I have seen none yet but Mr. *Cheney* and this Impleader that pretend to bring proof of the Lawfulness of the Points of Conformity which we avoid. And to Mr. *Cheney* I gave a Reply, which I judged satisfactory; and this man where they agree repeateth the same things, as if I had not Replied, and therefore I refer him to that Reply, rather than write the same over again. But in some things they as much differ from each other as from me.

§ 2. Pag.

§ 2. Pag. 4. He premiſeth, 1. *What are the Parts of the Book to which we are to declare our Aſſent and Conſent?* Anſw. *All things contained and preſcribed in and by it.* Are not theſe words plain? We are not for Equivocation: What he ſaith of this, is anſwered to Mr. *Ch.*

2. Pag. 9. He ſaith, [*It is granted by the Non-Conformiſts, that the Common-Prayer Book, as it is now amended and abſtracted from the Declarations and Subſcriptions required by the Act of Uniformity, is better to be aſſented to, than as it ſtood before.*

Anſw. 1. I know none of thoſe Non-conformiſts: It's better in ſome things (as the Tranſlation of the Epiſtles and Goſpels) and worſe to them in other. 2. But what's this to the Caſe?

3. Pag. 11. He ſaith, [*Non-Conformiſts grant, that it is better to ſubmit to the practice of a doubtful ſmall evil, than to forbear a neceſſary great Duty.*]

Anſw. This I anſwered to Mr. *Ch.* I know none of them that grant it. They ſuppoſe that *a doubtful Evil*] is really evil; and the *Doubt* will not make it *Lawful* (or *Better,*) but *Leſs Evil* than a greater: And that no *Duty* ſhould be forborn, while Duty, nor Evil done. But we muſt not forbear Duty till we can do it without adherent evil: But we muſt do our beſt to forbear all evil.

Ibid. He ſpeaketh againſt *over-ſtrict Interpretations of Impoſitions. Anſw.* I ſtand to Biſhop *Anderſon's* Solutions, whom he citeth, which are in the end of *The Firſt Plea for Peace.*

Pag. 12. 4. He ſaith, [*Practice is the beſt Expounder*

ounder of the Law : many Laws are worded fo terrorem iniquum petere, ut quod æquum eſt fe rant; Lex non curat minima. Neither the La of God or Man is ſolicitous about Circumſtances an the leſſer Punctilios.]

Anſw. 1. When they either comprehend the Leaſt in Generals, or name them particularly, we think they extend to them: And tha he that breaketh one of the Leaſt, and teacheth all be called Leaſt in the Kingdome o

Stat. 5. 2. The ſeven thouſand Miniſters (and more) that Conformed to the new-made Law 1662, did not ſtay till Practice expounded it. 3. And whoſe practice muſt it be that's the Expoſition? When your practices much much differ? 4. I think you abuſe the Law and Lawgivers, by making them firſt *injuſt*, *iniquum petendo*, and next *unintelligible*, and laſtly opening a door for *diſobedience*.

Pag. 13. 5. He noteth that we are not agreed what is *unlawful in Conformity*.

Anſw. 1. Nor are we agreed of all forbidden in Gods Laws; Muſt we therefore forbear no ſin? 2. We are agreed (as far as I know) of all the many particulars enumerated in the Plea: Deliver us from what we are agreed againſt. 3. The Biſhops of *England* are not agreed in how many things we muſt differ from the Papiſts: All are not for ſo much of theirs as the *Greeks*, or as *Grotius*, or Biſhop *Bramhal*, or Mr. *Thorndike*, or *Will. Forbes* of *Edenborough* were for. And what of that? Muſt not Popery be renounced till you are all herein agreed?

§ 3. Pag. 14. He noteth what I ſaid of the

root of the first difference between the old Non-conformists and Conformists, *One part cleaving to the Scripture, and the other being for retaining all that came in before 600, and common to them with the* Greeks, [*which* (saith he) *doubtless was the sounder Opinion; so that the Foundation of Non-conformity was laid on a false Principle, and they that built thereon frequently raised Sedition*, &c.]

Answ. 1. They that thought each mutable circumstance of Worship must have a particular Command in Scripture, erred; but there were few such, at least of any Learning: But those that took the Law of God in Nature and Scripture, for the only and perfect universal Law, did not erre.

2. So many Corruptions in Doctrine, Worship and Discipline came in *before* 600, and are *retained by the* Greek *Church*, that we cannot make that the measure of our Reformation: If you are for all [*that is common to the Papists and* Greeks] How prove you that you may Silence and Imprison all that are not?

3. And if this be the Rule, you are yet ill reformed. It is more than three and three Ceremonies and Additions which you yet want, which the Papists have: I could name such a Catalogue as might make *English-men* better understand what your Conforming Principles are, and what must be further expected when you are able. And the Council of *Florence* will tell us, when once *England* is of the *Greek* Religion, how possible it is to step over to the Pope. But why doth not the Church of *England* conform to the *Greek* Church now, if it be so great

a Duty, as will warrant the Silencing and Imprisoning of Refusers? I hear but of few that grow in love with their Worship, since the *Greeks* had a Church in *London*; especially Scholars that understand them.

4. But what if the first Non-Conformists erred? What's that to us any more than to you? We reverence the Primitive Example more than theirs; and never took them for the Masters of our Faith.

5. Your Charge of their *Sedition* is much more sharply laid on the Protestants in general by *Pateson, the Image of both Churches*, and by *Philanax Anglicus*, and many others, than you lay it on the old Non-conformists: and all parties can talk at that rate against others, as *Pryn* doth of *Prelates Treasons*.

§ 4. Pag. 15. *Of Assent and Consent to all things, and Subscription that nothing is contrary to the Word of God.* 1. He tells us, *What men have subscribed.* 2. *That we must allow it a just and favourable Construction.*

Answ. I grant that worthy men have subscribed, and that as favourable a construction must be made, as will stand with Truth and Justice. But this doth us no good.

§ 5. Pag. 16. Impl. [*All Lawgivers do leave to the Judges and Magistrates a Power to interpret the doubtful Letter of the Law, and to mitigate the rigour of its execution, in order to the publick good.*]

Answ. 1. I have answered this to Mr. *Cheney*: There is an Interpretation which giveth us the general obliging sence of the Law; which Conscience

ſcience muſt judge by, if we will ſubſcribe: and this belongeth only to the Lawgivers, as I have proved. And there is an Interpretation which only directs the Judicial Sentence, in this or that mans particular Caſe, as whether he ſhall be puniſhed as guilty or not; and this is it that belongeth to the Judges: If the Judges will put a falſe ſence on the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, I may not take them in that ſence. Their Expoſitory Power muſt direct their own Sentence, and that the Execution; but if I be put to Swear or ſubſcribe my ſelf to any impoſed words, no Judge can Abſolve me from taking them *in the uſual ſence, unleſs the Lawgivers give another.* This is our Rule, and we dare not Equivocate.

2. As to your confuſed talk, that [*Magiſtrates can diſpenſe with the leſſer parts of the Law,*] it is uſeleſs to me: The Lawgivers can expound, ſuſpend and change the Law: The Executive Magiſtrate can ſuſpend his own Sentence and Execution in ſome caſes; but not the ſence of the Law, nor allow my Conſcience to change the ſence.

§ 6. Impl. [*All that is required by the Act, is unfeignedly to Aſſent and Conſent that there is ſuch a meaſure of Truth and Goodneſs in the Book of Common Prayer, as qualifies it for the publick worſhip of God.*]

Anſw. 1. *Gratis dictum.* Who authorized you to ſay that [*Aſſenting and Conſenting to all things contained and preſcribed*] meaneth not as it ſaith? but only *an uſeable meaſure of Truth and Goodneſs?* Is this the uſual ſence of [*All things*, &c.]

It

If not, where have the Lawgivers given us another? If you can think ſo, why muſt all be ſilenced that think otherwiſe, and dare not be ſo bold?

§ 7 Impl. [*The title of the Act is the Key---- If Uniformity be obſerved, the Act is ſatisfied.*]

Anſw. The Declaration is not *de fine* only, but *de medio*, to ſecure Uniformity, by profeſt *Aſſent*, &c. All Lawyers know that Laws have uſually more in the Body than is in the Title.

§ 8. Impl. [*They ſay*, 1. *Aſſent implies the Truth, and Conſent the Goodneſs.* 2. *All things they ſay, meaneth all words and expreſſions.* 3. *by* [*to the uſe*] *is meant thoſe things that come not in uſe.* 4. *When it's ſaid*, in ſenſu compoſito, *contained and preſcribed in and by*, &c. *they extend it to all things that are contained as well as preſcribed.*]

Anſw. I ſee that Wit is uſeful to many ends: Here are ſo many and rare Expoſitory Evaſions, as *Eſcobar* or *Bunny* could not have excelled in them.

1. If *Aſſent* ſignifie not *Judging all to be true*, it hath lately got a new ſignification: *Conſent* indeed ſignifieth oft an object *practicable and exiſtent* for ſome good motive of Conſent.

2. If the [*all things*] in the Books, mean not [*all the words*] but [*things*] diſtinct from [*words*] I would we could know what they are: Sure it is not the *Paper and Ink* that the Parliament mean. Prayers and Forms are words. Actions or Ceremonies that are not words, are but little of the Book, or rather none of it, being but the matters commanded by it.

3. There

3. There is no word or part of the Book that was not made for ſome uſe. If not, how ſhall we know which words are uſeleſs?

4. I do not think that there was a man in the Parliament when the Act was made, that ever thought of this ſubtle Expoſition, that any man would take [*all conteined and preſcribed*] only *in ſenſu compoſito?* And ſo that we profeſs Aſſent *to nothing contained in the Book, but that which is preſcribed alſo.* If ſo, is not [*conteined*] an idle word when all men know that all that is *preſcribed* is *conteined?* And yet by that time preſcribed *Doctrines, Calendars, Rules, Forms,* &c. are taken in, they will prove more than my Aſſent and Conſent will reach to.

§. 9. Whereas the Commons brought the Lords to agree with them, for not limiting the ſenſe of the Declaration of Aſſent and Conſent to the *Uſe* of all; he anſwereth, 1. That *the Biſhops then were more our friends than the Commons:* As if the Biſhops always went with the major Vote of the Lords.

2. He giveth Reaſons, why it is meet that men *Approve* as well as *Uſe* what they do. And what elſe is it that we ſay, but the *Uſing* without *Approving*, ſatisfieth not the impoſition?

§ 10. He citeth my words, That *we may take an Oath, whoſe words in the plain and proper ſenſe are lawful.* But the Queſtion is, *Whether theſe be ſuch?*

§ 11. II. pag. 21. He defends the words, [*Eaſter-day on which the reſt depend, is always the firſt Sunday after the firſt Full-Moon, which happens next after the* 21 *of* March.] Which being

ott

oft false, he saith, 1. *Being a General Rule, it may be allowed to have some exception. Answ.* And so they say [*Always*] and they mean not always, but sometimes.

2. He proceedeth: [*The Rubrick doth not say,* [*a Rule*] *but* [*Rules*] *in the Plural: and where the first Rule fails, the defect is supplied in the second.*] *Answ.* What may not such a Wit prove *true* and *lawful*, if the man be willing? 1. The Rules contained in that Section under that Title, are only *this*, and one for *Advent* and other Sundays, and none for *Easter* but this. 2. To say, *This is always so*, and after to say the *contrary*, is but to say, *One is true, and the other false. Always* excludeth your acknowledged Falshood *sometimes.*

3. He saith, *The Defect never cometh into practice. Answ.* It's *an useable Rule*, and so you covenant to practice it, if *the Use of all things* be intended: and so you must keep two *Easter*-days.

Object. 4. [Mr. B. *might as well have objected against the Almanack, which saith* February *hath* 28 *days.*] *Answ.* So I should if it had said [*always*] and [*only* 28.]

§ 12. III. Impl. p. 22. defendeth these words, [*We are fully perswaded in our judgments, and we here profess it to the world, that the Book as it stood before established by Law, doth not contein any thing contrary to the Word of God.*] And 1. he blameth me for omitting the condition of *a just and favourable Construction*, &c. *Answ.* I undertook not to transcribe the whole Book, which is in so many hands: *A just construction* is still

ſtill ſuppoſed, and as *favourable* as will ſtand with *Truth*. I have oft enough told him the Rule by which we Interpret words, viz. *The ordinary ſence in which they are underſtood by men of the profeſſion which they belong to, unleſs the Speakers otherwiſe expound them.* If he thought this Rule to be falſe, he ſhould have diſputed that. If on pretence of [*favourable Interpretations*] you reſolve to put a good meaning on any words which your Intereſt perſwadeth you to take, *nobis non licet*, we cannot do ſo: elſe we could take any Oath in the world, while all words have divers ſences, and are arbitrary ſigns, which we can put what ſence upon that pleaſes us.

§ 13. Impl. p. 22, 23. [*He well knows our Aſſent to the words there mentioned is not required, nor could be intended. Anſw.* Utterly falſe: I know it not, but verily believe the contrary.

Impl. *For it is only a profeſſion of our Superiours that were then in being, what their judgment and belief was*, &c.] *Anſw.* So the Rubrick and the 39 Articles were the judgment of your Superiours: But are not they, and that Preface, parts of the Book? If not, tell us how we ſhall know what are parts of it, and to what we muſt conſent? And muſt you not Aſſent and Conſent to *all things in it?* I like not thoſe Equivocations, which will make Oaths and Promiſes to be but what the Speaker pleaſe.

§ 14. Impl. [*Mr.* B. *doth very ill to recount thoſe miſtranſlations in the old Book, which are amended in the new*, &c. ----*which Mr.* B. *knows to be falſe*, (*viz.* that *Aſſent* to them is required.)

Anſw. 1. How did this bold man know my thoughts?

thoughts? I know these words to be a deliberate Printed Fallhood, and this man to have so many such, as that to me he is incredible.

2. When the New Book justifieth the old, as having nothing contrary to the word of God, and you must Assent to *all things* in the *new one*, I think you assent to that justification. If you mean otherwise, tell men your own thoughts, but if you would any more be believed, speak not falsly of other men, whom you never knew.

3. The old Translation of the *Psalms* is still used, unreformed. Do you not Assent to that neither?

§ 15. He tells us that [Psal. 105. 28. *the two Translations are not contradictory, They were not obedient to his word, and they Rebelled not against his word: Because some Tranſlaters underſtood it of the* Egyptians, *and others otherwiſe.*]

Answ. And had the Text those contrary senses? If not, is not one of them contrary to the Text?

§ 16. Impl. p. 24. [*The same Answer will serve the exception against the* Collects *of the old Book, which for divers days together used the word* [*This day.*] *Answ.* And the same Reply will serve: You dare not say that on *Christmas*-day, *Whitsunday*, &c. [*This day*] signifieth not the very particular Day, but the Week or Time of the Year. And hath not the same Collect the same sense on the next days? Are your words like Cyphers, that change their power by such additions?

§ 17. Impl. [*Little reason have they to object against any words or phrases in the Liturgy, who*

are

are ſtill fond of ſinging Pſalms according to the Tranſlation of Strenhold *and* Hopkins, *&c.*]

Anſw. Little reaſon hath any man to be forward to believe your Affirmations, that are ſo uſed to falſhood. I finde none ſo willing to uſe other Verſions as they that you ſay are *fond* of this: many uſe the *Scot*'s Verſion, many *Barton*'s, ſome *Rous*'s, and ſome Mr. *Patrike*: And the reaſon why they no more forſake the old one, is not becauſe they are fond of it, but leſt they too much diſpleaſe the Church of *England*, which hath allowed no other, and thoſe that are apt to turn all Reformations and Varieties into reproach.

§ 18. IV. To what he ſaith of the *Apocrypha*, I anſwered already to Mr. *Cheney*, and will not now repeat. The Objections againſt the Fictions in *Tobit* are Biſhop *Barlow*'s, now of *Lincoln*, in a Learned M. S. written to ſatisfie Mr. *Dodwell*.

§ 19. V. Our great doubt about the abuſe of Godfathers, and excluding Parents from their proper Office, he ſaith nothing to that needs any reply; but what is in the Book which he anſwers, and in the Reply to Mr. *Cheny*, he anſwers as if he underſtood not the queſtion: and feigns the Liturgy to lay that on the Parents which it doth not, but excludes them from it, and laies it on uncapable perſons.

§ 20. Impl. p. 30. [*Mr.* B. *excepts againſt the Rubrick, which ſaith, It is certain by Gods Word, that Children, which are baptized, dying before they commit actual Sin, are undoubtedly ſaved.*] *This being a Rubrick, and never coming to Uſe in the Publick*

Publick Worship, it cannot reasonably be thought to be imposed as an Article of Faith on others, but only as the judgement of our Superiours.

Answ. I perceive the Parliaments Act and Declaration is to you a mere Nose of Wax; It meaneth what you will, or none can tell what. 1. Are Rubricks of no use? Yea those that determine of Doctrines, which are not only *de Fide*, but matters of Salvation, certain undoubted Salvation of all baptized Infants? What is of Use if these be not? 2. Are such Doctrines of certain Faith no parts of the Book? not contained in it? Is not your Superiour's judgment imposed on you to Assent to? What then is imposed to be believed?

§ 21. But p. 31. he citeth Texts as proving the truth of the Article.

Answ. Not a word to the purpose. He seems not to understand that it is not of the Salvation of *true Believers Infants* that we doubt: But whether this be true of all without exception that have such Godfathers as ours, that take not the Children for their own; even the Children of Atheists, Infidels, Heathens, Mahometans, &c. all which the Minister is bound by the Canon to Baptize, if offered.

§ 22. VII. Impl. 31. [*Mr.* B. *is the first that hath accused the Church of* England *of instituting a second Covenant of Grace.*]

Answ. Still more untruths. I have no such Accusation: It is but for making and imposing on pain of Rejection, &c. *another Sacrament, or a Sign too much Sacramental, of the same Covenant of Grace, which Baptism is the Sacrament of.* 2. And

of

of this he cannot truely ſay that I am the firſt.

I proved from the impoſed words and ends, that it is appointed to the uſes of a Sacrament, but indeed not by Chriſt, and therefore is but a humane Sacrament; And I anſwered his Objections to Mr. *Che.* which he taketh no notice of.

He cites me as ſaying, that Parents may offer their Children to Baptiſm, though they cannot have it without the Croſs, it being the Miniſters ſin, and not theirs. And what then? Is it therefore none of the Miniſters ſin, 1. To conſent to it. 2. To uſe it. 3. To refuſe to Chriſten Children whoſe Parents dare not ſubmit to it. 4. Nor the Biſhops to ſilence Miniſters that refuſe ſuch Conformity?

§ 23. p. 34, 35. He would explain the Rubrick by Art. 27. *Thoſe that rightly received Baptiſme*, &c. *and Chriſtian Proprietors may offer their Children*, &c.

Anſw. 1. The Canon forbiddeth the Miniſter to refuſe any as aforeſaid; What's this then to the reſt? 2. Right *coram Eccleſiâ* giveth the Church Power to receive them: But it muſt be Right *coram Deo* to Remiſſion, &c. that muſt aſſure their Salvation: which we cannot prove that the Children of Atheiſts, Sadduces, or Infidels have. 3. The Conformiſts are here themſelves divided: One part of them give that certain Salvation only to all baptized Infants, which the other give to all in the world, baptized or unbaptized. See Mr. *Che.* and the Anſwer.

§ 24. VIII. About our Refuſing Children,

whose Parents refuse the foresaid Crossing, and abuse of Godfathers, he saith, *p.* 36. [1. *That in private Baptisme*, and consequently in other cases of *Necessity*, *the Church alloweth the omission of Cross and Godfathers*. 2. *That they have a low esteem of the Sacrament*, *that for this withdraw*.]

Answ. 1. Your Consequence is contrary to the Canon: And 'tis known that the Church allows not Ministers to forbear them on pretence of such Consequences.

2. Much less do they allow the refusal of Dissenters for such a Necessity.

3. And it may be no contempt of the Sacrament, when men are afraid of a sinful use of it, though they mistake.

4. Nor is it such a fault of the Receiver or Parent, that will warrant a Minister to deny them Christendome, or a Sacrament by yourselves judged so necessary to Salvation.

§ 25. *p.* 36. He returneth to the case of Crossing, as a transient Image in worship, &c. I think few will judge his Answer worthy of a Reply.

§ 26. p. 37. I X. The next is, [*That no man should come to the Sacrament without a full trust in God's Mercy and a quiet Conscience.*] I would make nothing worse than it is: I do not think the Imposers meant that all men should stay away till they had *a full trust and quiet Conscience*. But that's the plain importance of the words. Here therefore it is more *ill words* than *ill meaning*, which I do deny Assent and Consent to.

§ 27

§ 27. X. Pag. 38. About compelling each Communicant to receive thrice a year, he ſaith, 1. *It is the Statute, not the Miniſter.* 2. *It is only the duely qualified.*

Anſw. 1. The Biſhops are Statute-makers. 2. Nothing more common with the Canoneers, than to call to Magiſtrates to execute ſuch Laws. 3. The Canons and Liturgy require it. 4. It is not true, that it's only *the duely qualified:* It is all that are not *Naturally*, but *Morally unfit*, that is, that are at Age, and have Reaſon and Health. If the Prieſt ſhould put away any as unfit, he muſt accuſe them to the Chancellor, and they muſt be Excommunicate and lie in Jayl while they live, unleſs they Communicate. So that here is a plain Expoſition. 4. There are multitudes unfit to Communicate, whom the Miniſter cannot put away, that were they not conſtrained, would keep away themſelves; as ſecret Atheiſts, Infidels, Sadduces, Socinians, Arians, Seekers, ſecret Fornicators, Thieves, Drunkards, &c. that are conſcious of their Sin and Impenitence: But rather than lie in Jayl, will all Communicate.

§ 28. Impl. [*What deplorable times are we fallen into, that our higheſt Priviledge ſhould be counted a great grievance*, &c.]

Anſw. Still deceit. 1. Is it our *higheſt Priviledge* to have unfit men conſtreined to prophane holy things, and profeſs themſelves what they are not; and the dogs forced in, that ſhould lie without? Is Chriſt's Diſcipline againſt our higheſt Priviledges? 2. Who knoweth not that Infidels, Sadduces and wicked men do account

these Priviledges to be none: Cure them of their Contempt, and you need not force them by a Jayl. Till then, is it the Pastors that refuse such till they voluntary seek it, or the Contemners of these Priviledges, that are to be reproved? Christ giveth pardon and life to none but desirous Consenters; and if you will seal and deliver the promise of it to those that will but prefer it to a Jayl, and make up your Churches on such terms, we dare not imitate you. The Church-Keys exercised are, as *Tertullian* speaketh, *Præjudicium futuri judicii*, and should intimate to men, who they be that shall be let into Heaven, or shut out: And to say, *Come all and take Christ, Pardon and Life, who will rather take the Sacrament than lye in a Jayl*, is like *another Gospel*.

§ 29. XI. *The pronouncing Salvation to all that they bury*, save the three excepted sorts, (Unbaptized, Excommunicate, and Self-murderers) is the next. And 1. he will not have the words to signifie *Salvation*. The words are [*Forasmuch as it hath pleased Almighty God, of his great Mercy, to take to himself the Soul of our dear Brother here departed.*] And [*we give thee hearty thanks, for that it hath pleased thee to deliver this our brother out of the miseries of this sinful world.*] And [*That we may rest in Him* (Christ) *as our hope is this our brother doth.*] If all this signifie not *Salvation* in your judgment, it doth in ours: We accuse not you of deceiving Souls, at a time when it will take the deepest impression; but we only tell you, we dare not Assent and Consent to that, which to us would be false Equivocation,

tion, and that in so serious a thing: And if the difference be but Grammatical, doth it deserve our Silencing and ruine, to believe that those words import *Salvation?*

§ 30. But 2. he saith, [*Christian Charity teacheth us to hope the best of all that die in the Communion of the Church.*]

Answ. It is not Christian Charity which is contrary to the Christian Verity and Covenant: Nor that which tendeth to undo the living by false hopes: *Hobbes* and such others as oppose Fundamentals, deride Christianity, or the Immortality of the Soul, some by Writing, some by common Talk, do die in the Church of *England:* I have heard Preachers lament their Numbers, Impudence and Increase; but never heard one of them Excommunicate, nor brought to publick Repentance. All die in the Church, that Communicate rather than lie in Jayl and be ruined; yea thousands that will not Communicate, notwithstanding such Severities; When in a Parish of 8000 or 10000 Communicants, no more (even on *a Whitsunday*) than about 100 Communicate, though the Minister be one of the best; yet the rest are still in your Church. We desire the highest degree of Charity. But such a judgment of mens future state, though called *Charitable*, seemeth to us so fearfully uncharitable, that it is one of the greatest things in which we seem to differ: And I will not shew the rise, and the import and tendency of it, lest Dr. *Fullwood*, and the *Reflecter* on *Sacril. Desert.* say again, that *I gather too hard* Consequences from our Difference. But *nobis non licet*, Must we

be Silenced and ruined for want of such *Charity?*

§ 31. XII. *Silencing such as think the Surplice unlawful*, is the next, *pag.* 42. And he saith, [*If any man, against such Authority and Arguments, should think the Surplice unlawful, it is better he should be Silenced, than that the Churches Peace and Order be disturbed, or antient Laws abrogated.*]

Answ. You have owned it: If it be well done, you may partake of the Reward; If ill, of the Punishment. *Qu.* Whether consenting so to Silence 2000 (and 9000 if they had not Conformed) will not make your Reward greater, than if you had consented and subscribed to the Silencing but of one? *His blood be on us and on our Children*, were the words of Factious Zeal, that escaped not without punishment. *Paul* that consented to the death of *Stephen*, and hunted others, saith, *He was mad, yea exceeding mad against them.* Christ never laid the *Order and Peace* of the Church, nor the Preaching of the Gospel on such things; nor ever encouraged any to do it. Of which see Bishop *Jer. Tailor* in the words largely cited in my *Second Plea.*

§ 32. XIII. Though *Athanasius* Creed as to the damnatory part was that which Mr. *Dodwell* scrupled, I will not answer this mans equivocating Exposition of it, lest I be thought to tempt others to blame the Creed itself, which I honour. Where he saith, p. 43. [*I frequently and falsely accuse the Conformists of Socinian or Antitrinitarian Doctrine:* Let him tell us where, or else

else I accuse him as a false Accuser. But it's his mode.

§ 33. XIV. Whereas all must Assent and Consent to read the Common-Prayer every day of the year, (if not specially hindred) he tells us what reason there is for it: But 1. will it not necessitate the omission in many places of more necessary works? 2. What encouragement have we to embody with that Tribe, who all *Consent to this*, and not one of multitudes of them do it? Is such Conformity tolerable, and our Preaching intolerable without it?

§ 34. XV. Pag. 46. He calls it *a Calumny* that I say the *Liturgy* is *defective* and *Disorderly*.

Answ. I did in 1660. draw up a Catalogue of the mere *defects* and *disorders*, but never offered it, to avoid offending them.

He tells us, 1. of *the disorders of the Directory*. (And had he proved it, is that a justification of the Liturgy?) 2. And also he tells us of *the defects and confusions which were in Mr* Baxter's *eight days exploit*, (our Additionals, or Reformed Liturgy, 1661.) when as neither this Accuser, nor any of the Bishops or Dissenters then said one word of particular accusation against it, nor any other that ever I knew of to this day, save an impertinent quarrel of Mr. *Roger le Strange*, that we used not more imposing words, and such trifles.

§ 35. XVI. Next comes the Profession of the Antiquity of *Three Orders* in the Preface of the Book of Ordination and elsewhere, p. 47. And he citeth me, *Christ. Direct.* p. 127. as against my self; falsly intimating, that I assert three

Orders, because I am uncertain whether there be not divers *Degrees* in one *Order*. I cited out of *Spelman* the Canons of *Ælfrike*, shewing that the Church of *England*, even in times of Popery took Bishops and Presbyters to be the same Order, as many Papists-Schoolmen do. And the man should have known, that it is not the Bishops of a particular Church that I mentioned in my *Direct.* but only such as have the care of *many Bishops Churches*.

§ 36. XVII. He next defends the Scenical Call to the people, to [*come forth and shew reason why the person may not be Ordained.*] As if he knew not, that it is not the sence of the words that is questioned; but that this insignificant Ceremony should be set in the place of the ancient demand of their free consent over whom the Minister is set, to seem as if they had still that liberty, when it is no such matter; nor do the people, whose Souls he is to have the charge of, know any thing usually of his Ordination; nor at his Institution, which sets him over them, have they any Call. Nor are so much as these Shews used at the Ordination of Bishops, which by the old Canons was void without the Peoples Consent.

§ 37. XVIII. Of the words, *Receive the Holy Ghost*, &c. he saith less than Mr. *Cheny*, whom I have answered.

§ 38. XIX. So have I there answered (p. 11, 12.) what he saith for the Oaths of Obedience to Archbishops, Bishops, Chancellors, *&c.* 1. It's one thing to *Obey* them, and another to Assent to the Oath of Obedience. 2. And it's one thing

thing to swear Obedience to them, as exercising the power of Magistrates under the King; and another thing as Laymen exercising the power of the Church-Keys, &c. And I have elsewhere cited divers old Canons, that condemn such Oaths as dangerous.

§ 39. XX. In the 20th Chap. to Mr. *Cheny* I have abundantly answered what he saith here about keeping men from the Sacrament, and informing the Ordinary.

These be [*the Number*] of our Exceptions which the Impleader could finde, though the rest were as plainly written.

§ 40. XXI. As for our *Objections against the Declarations and Oaths required by Act of Parliament, because it is not the sence of the Liturgie, but of an Act of Parliament that we doubt of, he refers us to the Executioners of the Law for our Instruction,* (their natural way of satisfaction:) the Justice and Jailor I suppose. Did these satisfie him to Conform herein? Doth he take such Arguments for unanswerable? Why did he pretend to defend the rest, which are imposed in the same Act? These are greater matters than the Ceremonies, and need as clear a Justification.

§ 41. But that you may see the measure of his Knowledge, he can tell you, that *our mistake is wilful, and an act of pure malice and revenge.*

Answ. Our Rule oft mentioned is agreed on by Casuists, viz. *To take such Oaths, Promises and Professions, in the sense of the imposing makers of them,* (if they are our Rulers) *and unless they give us another sense, we must take the ordinary sense that those words are used in to be theirs.* Therefore

fore we take [*on any pretence whatsoever*] and [*those Commissioned by him*] and [*any alteration of Government in the Church*] and [*not at any time endeavour*] and [*no obligation on any other person*] as well as [*Assenting and Consenting to all things conteined and prescribed*] to have that meaning, which not only our Parents that taught us to speak, and our Masters and Dictionaries, and the use of such as we hear talk, hath taught us to take such words in; but also in the sense of the Lawyers and Law-books which we are acquainted with, unless any odde persons differ from the rest. And this sagacious man hath found, that this Exposition is *a wilful mistake, in malice and revenge.* Just as others of them can prove before God, that it is through *Covetousness that we Conform not*; viz. Two thousand Ministers (*England* knoweth of what sort, though the Accusers do not) have forsaken all Church-maintenance, and their Rulers countenance, and put themselves under a Law that mulcts them 40 *l.* a Sermon, banisheth them from Cities and Corporations, lays them in Jayl, &c. reproacheth them as seditious; and all this in *Covetousness*, *Malice*, and *Revenge*. I have seen a Child throw away his meat in revenge, but he returned to it in less time than 18 years: I have heard of a woman that cut her throat, and another that drowned herself and Children, in a revengeful passion against her drunken cruel Husband: but sure, if she had 18 years deliberated, it would have calm'd her passion: But that 2000 such Ministers should chuse ruining Fines, and Poverty, and Jails, and wilfully damn their

own

own Souls by ſin, and all to be *revenged* on *Parliament* or *Prelates*, is ſomewhat ſtrange! Eſpecially when it is that which that Parliament and Prelates themſelves are pleaſed with, who choſe the terms. What kinde of *Revenge* hath our *Malice* found out, which deſtroyeth ourſelves and pleaſeth our Afflicters!

§ 42. And here p. 55. he falls with ſcorn on my Book of *Concord*; and that his Book may be Conformable to itſelf, deſcribeth my terms of Concord by downright *fiction* and *falſhood*; as if he had thought none would ever open the book to ſhame his Calumny. He tells you, that the reſult of all is, *That every Paſtor be independent, free from any ſuperiour to controul him, and have an arbitrary Power, and arbitrarily exerciſe the power of the Keys without Appeal; to have the power of Ordaining who they will, the power of altering the Laws in Church and State*, &c. All which I have expreſly written againſt at large.

Beſides what I have written, 1. For Biſhops in each Church. 2. For Archbiſhops or general Overſeers. 3. For Synods. 4. Had it been no more than what I have written for the Magiſtrates Governing of all Paſtors and Churches, it would prove the falſhood of this mans Aſſertion.

Yet that you may ſee that his *Charity* and his *Veracity* are proportionable, he hence inferrs, p. 57. [*Did ever any Biſhop aſpire to ſuch Tyranny as this, the Pope only excepted? Is not the King and whole Nation greatly culpable not to truſt themſelves with the ingenuity of this people*, &c.]

Anſw. Reader, which is liker to be guilty of Tyranny, 1. We that deſire no power but to plead

plead God's Law to mens Consciences. 2. And that but with one Congregation. And 3. with no constrained unwilling persons, but only voluntary Consenters. 4. And to rule over none of our Fellow-Ministers. 5. And only to be but Freemen, as Schoolmasters and Philosophers be in their Schools of Volunteers, that we may not against our Consciences be the Pastors of the unwilling, or such as we judge uncapable according to God's Laws, but to use the Keys of Admission and Exclusion as to that particular Church. 6. And to do all under the Government of the Magistrate, who may punish us as he may do Physicians, Schoolmasters, or others, for proved maladministration, and drive us (not from, but) to our Duty. 7. And to be ready to give an account of our Actions to any Synod, or Brethren that demand it, and to hear their Admonitions and Advice. Yea, and to live in peaceable submission where Archbishops or General-Visitors are set over us; and upon any Appeals or Complaints, to hear and obey them in any lawful thing belonging to their Trust and Power. 9. And if we be judged to have wrongfully denied our Ministerial help and Communion to any, we pretend to no power to hinder any other Church or Pastor from receiving him. 10. And if we be by Magistrates cast out or afflicted for our Duty, we shall quietly give up the Temples and publick Church-maintenance, of which the Magistrate may dispose, and without resisting or dishonouring him, endure what he shall inflict upon us, for our obedience to God. This is our odious Tyranny.

2. On

2. On the other ſide, our Accuſers, 1. Some of them are for power in themſelves to force men by the Sword, that is, by Mulcts and corporal Penalties, to be ſubject to them, or be of their Church and Communion. 2. Others are for the Magiſtrate thus forcing them, when the Biſhop Excommunicates them. 3. They thus make the Church like a priſon, when no man knoweth whether the people be willing Members, or only ſeem ſo, to eſcape the Jail. 4. They would be ſuch forcing Rulers over many ſcore or hundred Pariſhes. 5. They would have power to Rule, Suſpend and Silence the Paſtors of all theſe Pariſhes, when they think meet. 6. They hinder the Paſtors of the Pariſh-Churches from that exerciſe of the Keys aforeſaid in their own Pariſh-Churches, which belongs to the Paſtors Office. 7. They would compel the Pariſh-Miniſters to Admit, Abſolve, or Excommunicate (at leaſt as declaring other mens Sentences, when it is againſt their Conſciences. 8. They would make Miniſters ſwear Obedience to them, and Biſhops ſwear Obedience to Archbiſhops. 9. Some of them are for their power to Excommunicate Princes and greateſt Magiſtrates, though contrary to the fifth Commandment, it diſhonour them. 10. Some of them ſay, that if the King command one Church-Order, or Form, or Ceremony, and the Biſhop another, the Biſhop is to be obeyed before the King: As alſo if the King bid us *Preach*, and the Biſhop forbid us. 11. And they ſay, that their Cenſures, even *Clave errante*, muſt be obeyed. 12. And that he whom a Biſhop cuts off from

one Church, is thereby cut off from all, and not may receive him. 13. And that it is lawful to ſet up Patriarchs, Metropolitans, &c. to rule the Church, according to the ſtate and diſtribution of Civil Government. Look over theſe two Caſes, and judge which party is liker to Church-Tyrants; and then judge what Credit is due to ſuch Accuſers of the Non-Conformiſts in this Age.

§ 43. II. As to Reordination, I have anſwered to Mr. *Cheny* what he ſaith: He deceitfully avoideth determining the firſt Queſtion, whether they intend a Reordination or not: Whereas I have proved, 1. That the Church of *England* is againſt twice Ordaining. 2. That they call it and take it for a true Ordination which is to be received from them, by ſuch as Presbyters had Ordained. 3. And therefore that they ſuppoſe the former Null. 4. And this is much of the reaſon of mens doubting whether they ſhould receive the ſecond, which is given on ſuch a Suppoſition. But this man is little concerned in the true ſtating of the caſe.

§ 44. III. What he ſaith of the Miniſters power for Diſcipline, is anſwered already to Mr. *Cheney* that hath the ſame.

§ 45. About the Covenant, 1. he falſly makes me ſay, that *the King took it*: Whereas (whether he did or not) I only ſay, that he was *injuriouſly and unlawfully drawn to ſeem to owne it and declare for it.*

2. Next he aggravates this Injury: And who contradicteth him?

3. He pleadeth, *That the King is not obliged by*

by it to make any alteration in the Government of the Church.

Answ. I will not examine your Reasons: The King never made me his Confessor, nor put the question to me; Why then should I make my self a Judge of it? And why must my Ministry lie on a thing beyond my knowledge? But am I sure that no Parliament-man that took that Vow is bound there in his place to endeavour a Reforming Alteration, when I am past doubt that much is needful?

He would 1. make it doubtful, *Whether it was a Vow to God?* I think it not worth the labour to prove it to him that doubteth of it after deliberate reading it.

2. He saith, [*Any lawful endeavours are not denied.*] *Answ.* But the *Obligation to lawful endeavours are denied.* Are not the words *universal?*

3. He saith, [*The Covenant condemned as unlawful, cannot lay an Obligation.*]

Answ. A Vow to God unlawfully *imposed* and *taken*, may binde to a *Lawful Act.*

4. He calls it [*unnecessary alterations against the Law of the Land.*]

Answ. I suppose I shall prove some reforming alteration necessary; And it is not against Law for a Subject to petition for it, or a Parliament-man to speak for it. Yet when the man seems to me to be pleading Conscience out of the Land, he saith, [*Would not this cause the Christian Religion in a short time to be exploded out of all Kingdoms?*] Alas poor people! what uncertain Guides have you?

5. He concludes, that *the power of Reforming being*

being in the King, the Vow was null. Answ. The Regal Power of Reforming is only in the King: To change Laws without him, is Usurpation. But Parliament-men may speak for it, and Subjects petition, and on just causes write and speak for needful Reformation: And I speak for no other.

§ 45. IV. About *not taking Arms against those Commissioned by the King*; He plainly professeth that we must not distinguish where the Law doth not. And if it be an unlimited Universal Negative, it will quite go beyond *Mainwaring* or *Sibthorpe*: And for all his talk, my ignorance of the Law shall suspend my Subscription. 1. King *John* gave up his Kingdom to the Pope: I cannot say it had been unlawful for the Kingdom to resist such as he should have Commissioned to execute it. 2. Nor such as should be Commissioned to dispossess the right Heir, and settle it on a Stranger, or an Enemy. 3. Nor such as should be Commissioned to seize on all the Subjects Estates or Lives, yea or lay Taxes contrary to Law, in cases where the Law enableth the Sheriff by the *Posse Comitatus* to resist. 4. Nor if any get the Broad-Seal to Commissions to seize on the King's Garrisons, Forts, Navies, Treasures, Guards, whereby a traiterous Lord-Keeper might at any time Depose the King. I have told you, that old Parliaments Popish and Protestant, and Archbishop *Abbot*, and Bishop *Bilson*, &c. were as much Nonconformists in this as I am.

And so much to the Impleaders Accusations of the Nonconformists, and his Reasons for the justifying

justifying of their Silencing and ruine, and the Lawfulness of some of the things which they judge to them unlawful: Let the impartial Reader try and judge. The rest of my Book, which is the far greater part, he answereth by contempt and silence.

CHAP. IV.

Of his dealing with the Second Plea *for Peace.*

WHile we hear men, that should be our Brethren, go on to call to Magistrates for Execution of the Laws (which they have got) against us, and for want of matter of Accusation against those that they prosecute, raking up odious Criminations from the late Wars, which few of the now Silenced Ministers had any hand in; and never ceasing to tell men, that the Beginners of that War were guilty of the King's Death. After 17 or 18 years Silence, 1. I told them, That two parties of the Episcopal Conformists being the beginners, in *England*, it's wonder'd that they see not how they accuse themselves: And why do they not profess Repentance first? 2. I fully told them what are our Principles of Government and Obedience, and intreated them to shew me, wherein they are disloyal or culpable. And this man is the first

that I finde pretending to assault it, and shame-
lessly passeth over the Book it self, and by his
silence seemeth to justifie our Doctrine. And yet
to shew his Will, he taketh occasion again to
rake up the foresaid actions of the evil Civil
War, as if that were any thing to the present
Cause; or as if he were calling the dead to
Judgment: (For we have oft offered them
thanks, if they will Silence only those that had
a hand in those Wars.) 2. He taketh on him
to answer my Historical Preface; and therein
heapeth abundance of untruths, part of which I
mentioned in the second Chapter, and the rest
I have so fully confuted in my Answer to Mr.
Hinkley, and in an Historical Index of those af-
fairs, that I will not waste my own and the
Readers time, by saying the same things here
again. And his Accusations of my *Concord* and
Moral Prognostication, I have answered before.
It is the manner of the man to *name Books*, and
take occasion from somewhat in them, to pour
out that which he most abounds with; and to
try, whether men will take this for a Confuta-
tion. O miserable world! Where the very
Preachers of Holiness, Love and Peace, go on to
the Grave, and Judgment, and Eternity, fighting
against Holiness, *Love* and *Peace*; forbidding o-
thers to worship God, (that cannot swallow all
their Inventions) and not enduring their Bre-
thren to live in Peace among them. But 'tis
Letter in the World of Holy Love and Peace.

A REFLECTION *on the* REFLECTER *on a Book againſt* Sacrilegious Deſertion *of the* Sacred Miniſtry.

51. WHen the King, being more merciful than the Canoneer Clergy, had granted Licenſes to the Nonconformiſts, for the publick worſhipping of God in peaceable Aſſemblies, many of the Clergy ſtill cryed down ſuch Aſſemblies as Schiſmatical; when before they ſeemed to lay the charge of Schiſm on them, for their want of Authority: And theſe are the men, that when it is for their Intereſt, are zealous defenders of the Royal Power againſt ſome Parliaments Limitations; but their Intereſt can extol, or at leaſt abſolve Mr. *Hooker* himſelf. Some of them would have perſwaded us to forbear the Liberty which the King had granted us, and ſo to be the Silencers of our ſelves, and to forbear Gods publick Worſhip till we dare Conform. And no wonder, when they apprehended ſuch diſmal Conſequents to their Church from our Preaching, as Mr. *Hinkley* in his Letter-book hath told you. Among others, Dr. *Fulwood* would have drawn us into half this guilt, on pretence of perſwading us to the moderate uſe of our Licenſes. On which occaſion I wrote a ſmall Book, to prove that *wilful deſerting of our Miniſtry* even when it is forbidden unjuſtly, and yet remaineth notoriouſly neceſſary to the ends

of the Institution) *is downright Sacriledge, and worse than alienating Church-Goods or Lands.* But I took occasion in it to deal as plainly with those Non-Conformists who are inclined to unwarrantable Separations, as with our Accusers. Dr. *Fulwood* wrote an Answer to this Book: I never replyed, partly that they may see that I can give such men the honour of having the last word, and partly to save mine own and the Readers time. But now either he, or some other unnamed Author that is marked *M. A.* hath published more *Useful Reflections* on that Book. He knoweth to what use, and let him use them accordingly.

§ 2. I. Part of his Reflections are Citations out of that and other of my Books, of such words as seem to be for them, and against the Non-Conformists and my self. II. The other part is his descant on the words, which he disliketh, and setteth them to the Tune which suits his Inclination, and may serve his turn.

Should I Print an Answer to such stuff as this, and in many Sheets tell men where and how such men speak amiss, the Reader might think that Satan hath such power on me, as by any of his Instruments, at his pleasure, to draw me to cast away my own and other mens precious time.

§ 3. All therefore that I shall say to him shall be this, I. As to the first, that 1. I can reconcile my own words, though he cannot: And as he never desired me to teach him to do it, I am not at leisure to offer him my Service: All is not contradiction, which men that understand not

not words do think so. 2. Readers, You see here when they call for Moderation, and would have us come as near them as we can, they do but turn it to reproach. And one that granteth them all that they cite out of my Books, and comes as near them as I do, is nevertheless thought unsufferable by them, in the exercise of the Ministry and out of Jayl. This is the spirit of the men.

§ 4. II. To the other part I only say, The man mistakes all the question; which is not, *Whether I be good or bad, learned or unlearned:* Let this be determined with him as he will. I am so ignorant and bad, that I will not now trouble him with much contradiction. But the question is, 1. *Whether the two thousand Ministers were justly Silenced?* 2. *And whether if they wilfully (though so Silenced) desert the Ministry to which they were Devoted and Consecrated, they will not be guilty of damnable Sacriledge and Perfidiousness?* If the man will speak to purpose to this question, it is like that some one will confute his Defence of so great a sin, when I am past this unpleasant Military Work.

A Note on *J. Varney's* Book against the Diſſenters from the Church of *England.*

INſtead of Confuting it, I commend the reading of it to ſuch as would ſee which ſide hath Phanaticks. It declareth that J. Varney *hath by Faith pulled down the Devils Kingdome; and that King* Charles 2. *ſhall be Emperour of all Nations, by whom Chriſt will govern them; greater than* Turk, *Pope, or* French. *And the way is,* The Diſſenters from the Government of the Church of *England* muſt be made Hewers of wood and Drawers of Water, and muſt pay all Taxes and Payments of the Land, to maintain the Forces that ſhall preſerve the Land againſt them: Like Decimation.

Notes on Mr. Le Strange's *Caſuiſt uncaſed.*

I Have had ſome gentle Touches from this Muſical hand heretofore, which I found not my ſelf obliged to anſwer. Nor ſhall I now ſay any more than this:

1. *That he that fetcheth his chief Stings and Scorns from a Book, and the leaf of another Book about twenty years or longer at leaſt revoked and obliterated*

obliterated, sheweth that if with Austin *we wrote* Retractations, *such men would turn all to reproach.*

II. *That I make not Mr.* Le Strange's *judgment the measure of my Repentance or Retractations.*

III. *That I have never had the Schooling of him, and so never taught him to understand my Writings, and therefore undertake not that things congruous shall not seem contradictions to him. But I can reconcile more than he can. For instance,* 1. *My Disputation of* Scandal, Plea Second, *reconcileth what he dreamed was contradiction, about imposing things evil by accident.* 2. *I can reconcile the* Kings having power about the circumstances, yea and substance of Religion; and yet that he hath none but what he had from Christ. *But I have not leasure for such work as this.*

IV. *Mr.* Le Strange *quite mistakes the Non-Conformists Question, as* the Reflecter *doth; as if* Hissing and Stinging *were disputing. He seemeth to make the Question to be*, Whether I be not a giddy, mutable, self-contradicting Fool and Knave: *Let him in that believe what pleases himself. Our Question is*, Whether Silencing, Fining, Imprisoning the Non-Conformists, be the way of Peace, and of the desired Concord of Protestants? *Yea, Whether Concord be possible on those Terms, and they will ever end our sad Divisions.*

Notes

Notes on a Dialogue between the Pope and a Phanatick.

MR. L. Strange's *Dialogue minds me of this, for it is a Book not to be forgotten: The Scope of it is to shew, that the* Non-Conformists *are designing to Destroy the King; that their Principles are rebellious; that they have so far prevailed already, that we must have no King, or no Parliament; which yet being needful, and the genius of the Parliament thus corrupted, the King must choose his own Councellors, and take the choice from the People (to this sense), and all the Loyal Subjects must give their hands, and list or engage themselves to defend the King against these Conspirators. Just the Meal-Tub Plot! But my Second Plea was written to answer such as this; and I leave the fuller Answer to those that are more concerned in it.*

So much against this Regiment of Accusers.

Turba gravis Paci placidæque inimica quieti.

FINIS.